

Special Series
on 'Isms': 1

SOCIAL ORDER

MAY 1954

• 40c •

\$4 A YEAR

CAPITALISM

Bernard W. Dempsey

Rendezvous with Destiny

TVA: Blight or Blessing?

Trends + Letters + Books

SOCIAL ORDER

Vol. IV

MAY, 1954

No. 5

... just a few things: 193

TVA: Blight or Blessing?
Carl J. Armbruster 194

Capitalism Bernard W. Dempsey 199

East is West John E. Blewett 209

Rendezvous with Destiny
Donald McDonald 221

Trends 227

Incomes Continue Rise; Government in Business; Co-op Growth; Unemployment Aid Studies; Unemployment Benefits; Human Relations Workshops; Technicians on the Spot.

Books 229

Problem of Abuse in Unemployment Benefits; Struggle for Africa; Russia, What Next? Imperial Communism; Moscow and the Chinese Communists; War, Communism and World Religions; Crisis in the Kremlin; Soviet Empire; From Lenin to Malenkov; World Power in the Balance; Soviet Policy in the Far East; Foreign Policy without Fear; Philosophy and the Ideological Conflict; Introduction to the Theory of Games; Natural Law; Hume: Theory of Politics; Hume: Theory of Knowledge; Hilaire Belloc; Government of the Catholic Church; Max Josef Metzger; Benjamin Franklin; Fearless Heart; Promises to Keep; Economic Resources and Development of Formosa.

Letters 238

Worth Reading [iii]

FRANCIS J. CORLEY
Editor

RAYMOND BERNARD
Managing Editor

Contributing Editors

LEO C. BROWN
JOHN L. THOMAS
JOSEPH M. BECKER
BERNARD W. DEMPSEY
PHILIP S. LAND
WILLIAM A. NOLAN

Editorial Advisory Board

THOMAS C. DONOHUE
J. NORMAN McDONOUGH
THOMAS P. NEILL
KURT VON SCHUSCHNIGG
CARL F. TAEUSCH

Associate Editors: John E. Blewett, John J. Carroll, Francis H. Conklin, Robert J. McNamara, F. James Wetzel

SOCIAL ORDER, registered at U. S. Patent Office. Contents copyright by Institute of Social Order, 1954.

Published monthly (except July and August) by the Institute of Social Order at 3655 W. Pine Boulevard, St. Louis 8, Mo.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, \$4 a year; \$7 for two years; \$9 for three years. Single copy, 40c. Entered as second class matter at the post office at St. Louis, Mo., U. S. A.

A volume index to this review is published annually in the December issue. The contents are currently indexed in **Sociological Abstracts**, **Public Affairs Information Service**, **Population Index**, **Psychological Abstracts** and **Catholic Periodical Index**.

Institute of Social Order
3655 West Pine Boulevard
St. Louis 8, Missouri
U. S. A.

... just a few things:

THE MIGHTY TVA SYSTEM has been a Mecca for the thousands of foreigners who have visited the United States since the end of World War II. The size of its operation, the scope and variety of the benefits it has brought to the area it serves have fired their imaginations. But TVA is not a traditional American institution; it is a new thing, inaugurated, as Mr. Armbruster shows, in the emergency of World War I, expanded tremendously as part of the depression-inspired public-works program of the New Deal. As the TVA attains its majority, the author suggests we give it a careful scrutiny.

DISCUSSION OF social issues is frequently hampered by conflict between ideas about what man is and what the societies he lives in are intended to do, however clearly participants may understand others' positions. When basic issues are confused by misunderstandings, discussion becomes almost impossible.

Many issues are thus obscured today. Concepts and categories that once were shibboleths and rallying-cries have become blurred in meaning. Granville Hicks' efforts to sort out the Retarded Liberals, the Fake Liberals, the ordinary rank-and-file liberals, the small-city liberals, the Some-of-Us Liberals in *Where We Came Out* is an example of the helpless confusion in which words can involve men. And John Cogley's liberal, for instance, is a somewhat different thing from Hicks'.

The term capitalism presents a similar problem. When Father Edward Keller says, for instance, "This Christian social order would not require radical changes in the institutions of American Capitalism," he is evidently talking about a quite different thing from the

object Count della Torre had in mind: "communism as an economic system (prescinding from its whole philosophy) is not so . . . in conflict with the nature of Christianity as is capitalism."

SOCIAL ORDER begins a series of articles on some of these moot terms with Father Dempsey's discussion of "capitalism" in this issue. Dr. Thomas P. Neill will treat "liberalism" in our September issue. Others will follow.

THE STORY OF INJUSTICES done to Japanese-American citizens at the outbreak of World War II has never been adequately presented to the American people. Just four years ago, SOCIAL ORDER told the story in its April, 1950, issue. Since the circulation of the magazine was restricted at that time, most of our readers did not have the opportunity to read that article (although it was reprinted in five foreign publications). Father John E. Blewett, who is intimately acquainted with both Japanese and Nisei, retells the story in this issue. The earlier article was written by Timothy L. McDonnell, who was familiar with the situation in his native California.

THE NEWS EDITOR of *The Catholic Messenger*, Davenport, Iowa, diocesan newspaper, Donald McDonald, recognizes the great contribution to social reform in the United States made by our outstanding liberals of the past fifty years. Mr. McDonald, a Marquette University graduate, has been making some outstanding contributions to liberal social reform in the pages of his paper and is now at work on a volume of essays.

F. J. C., S.J.

*Tremendous benefits must be weighed
against massive human losses*

TVA: Blight or Blessing?

CARL J. ARMBRUSTER, S.J.

THIS MAY the Tennessee Valley Authority will celebrate its twenty-first birthday. Born during the hectic first "Hundred Days" of the New Deal, nurtured on fierce opposition, matured in time to contribute to America's industrial effort in World War II, TVA seems to have been destined a child of conflict. This 1.74-billion dollar, government-owned corporation is something unique in the United States. TVA's huge dams and generators are the concrete embodiment of a new line of thought in the philosophy of government, one having far-reaching consequences to the American way of life.

It is important therefore, that every citizen know something of the organization and historical development of the Tennessee Valley Authority, along with the basic points of controversy. The issues are vigorously disputed today. However, no attempt is made here to resolve them, but merely to indicate their nature.

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY

To the average American, the words "Tennessee Valley" conjure up a picture of a valley somewhere in Tennessee through which a river flows, a place where the government has built some dams. Such a picture, however, is misleading, for the Tennessee Valley is not

just an ordinary valley. It is a watershed whose area, drained by the Tennessee river, extends over 40,000 square miles touching seven states and involving over two and one-half million people. The river stretches for 862 miles, a more sizeable stream than either the Rhine or the Rhone. It flows through a region which has an average rainfall of 52 inches; it originates high in the mountains and thus has a remarkable percentage of drop. All these factors—length, volume and drop—make it a tremendous natural force either for progress or for destruction.

During many years the Tennessee river charged about unbridled, causing incalculable damage to life and property and making the Valley a place of insecurity, want and low standards of living. The result was that the people of the Valley, mostly small farmers, were stricken with poverty though they lived in a region abounding with rich natural resources.

The potentialities of the Valley were extraordinary. Extensive deposits of coal, iron and bauxite were hidden away in the hill country of the Tennessee; the plunging waters of the river could be tamed to produce electric power; the land, if scientifically farmed, could yield rich harvests. But how were all these potentialities to be realized? The people

of Tennessee could not pull themselves up by their own bootstraps; it required sums of money to harness the river. Such an undertaking would affect a region extending into Tennessee, North Carolina, Alabama, Georgia, Virginia, Kentucky and Mississippi. The federal government decided to bridle the Tennessee and transform it into a well-trained and responsive servant of mankind. This it undertook through the Tennessee Valley Authority, established by Act of Congress, May 18, 1933.

TVA ESTABLISHED

When war threatened the country in 1916, Woodrow Wilson ordered plans to be drawn up for the construction of a dam and two nitrate plants at Muscle Shoals, Alabama, on the Tennessee River. The purpose of the dam was to generate hydro-electric power to supply the nitrate plants for munition production. But the plants were not completed till the end of the war, too late to be of service, and not until November 9, 1918, two days before the Armistice, did work begin on Wilson Dam. By 1925, all construction was completed, and the government found itself in the embarrassing situation of owning a dam and two nitrate plants without knowing exactly what to do with them.

Senator George Norris of Nebraska was convinced he had a perfect plan for utilizing these properties. In 1928 he got a bill through Congress providing for a series of dams in the Tennessee Valley which would effect flood control and generate hydro-electric power. President Coolidge vetoed the measure. In 1931 Norris cried again, only to see the bill killed by President Hoover. During the twenties there was speculation that Henry Ford intended to buy the Muscle Shoals properties, but Congress had no inclination to sell. Such was the stalemate when in 1933 Franklin Delano Roosevelt stepped into the White

House. It was not long before Senator Norris broached his project to the President who heartily endorsed it, and Congress passed the desired legislation.

In the TVA Act, Congress clearly outlined the project's six principal objectives:

1. the maximum amount of flood control;
2. the maximum development of said Tennessee River for navigation purposes;
3. the maximum generation of electric power consistent with flood control and navigation;
4. the proper use of marginal lands;
5. the proper method of reforestation of all lands in said drainage basin suitable for reforestation, and
6. the economic and social well-being of the people living in said river basin.¹

To accomplish such an all-inclusive plan the organization had to be flexible, so TVA was established with the same power as a privately-owned corporation. Today it remains subject to Congress inasmuch as Congress can dissolve it and dictate its policies in a very broad way through the grant or denial of appropriations. But the past has shown that Washington has interfered little in the operation of TVA. To manage TVA the President is empowered to appoint three directors, one of whom is designated as chairman. These directors are responsible to the President and to Congress, but practically they have complete freedom of action. As to its financial management, TVA is subject to annual inspection, and profits are turned over to the U. S. Treasury.

DISPUTE ABOUT TVA

The ink was not yet dry on the TVA Act when private utility companies launched an all-out attack. It was only natural that Southern utilities should fear this new competitor. They adamantly charged that the practical objective of TVA was power production, no matter how the legal wording of the

¹ *Statutes of the United States of America Passed at the First Session of the Seventy-Third Congress, Washington, D. C., 1933, 69.*

Act read, and that flood control and navigation were but a constitutional subterfuge. Finally the issue was brought to trial and in 1939 the Supreme Court decided in favor of the constitutionality of TVA. Commonwealth and Southern, under the leadership of Wendell L. Willkie, lost the case, but private utilities still carry on the campaign against TVA.

Even today critics maintain that TVA is not being honest with the public. The Authority claims that as a business corporation it can sell electricity at exceptionally low rates, 4.42 mills per kilowatt-hour,² and still make a good profit. TVA consumers are said to save \$60 million per year on their electric bill.³ On the profit side, TVA's power investment of \$710,000,000 yielded in 1953 a net profit of \$19,294,000, a return of 2.7 per cent.⁴

The opposition vehemently denounces these claims on the grounds that TVA is not operating as an ordinary business. First of all, TVA does not pay federal taxes as private utilities do. The Authority is supposed to make payments to state and local governments "in lieu of taxes," but these amount to about three per cent of its income; private utilities pay out about 22 per cent of their income in state, local and federal taxes.⁵

Secondly, TVA pays no interest on the \$710 million it has received from Congress since 1933 and allocated to the uses of power production.⁶ These

appropriations would, for a private company, constitute loans from the government. Any private company has to pay interest on its loans.

Therefore, it seems to TVA's critics that the Authority should stop masquerading as a successful business venture when it is not playing the business game according to the rules. It is unlikely that private utilities can hope to match TVA rates, not while TVA enjoys the above-mentioned advantages.

Another center of controversy has been the "electric yardstick"—a ghost which has haunted TVA since its birth. Much ink has been spilled in publicizing the fact that TVA rates would force down rates of private utility companies to a fair level. David Lilienthal, former director and guiding genius of TVA, himself debunks the yardstick idea.

The particular rates embodied in the TVA schedule were not to be an absolute standard of precisely what should be charged for electricity anywhere and everywhere in the country, with the implication that any company charging more than the TVA rate was therefore proved an extortionist. The country is far too diverse, conditions are far too varied, for any such oversimplification. The example this valley has supplied is a yardstick in a much more important sense. It has been demonstrated here, to the benefit both of consumers and utilities that drastic reductions in electric rates result in hitherto undreamed-of demands for more electricity in homes and on farms.⁷

ACHIEVEMENTS OF TVA

At present 29 dams comprise the water-control system, 24 of them owned by TVA and five owned by the Aluminum Company of America. This network of dams and reservoirs has succeeded in reducing tremendously the damage caused by floods in the Tennessee Valley. TVA estimates that the flood damage averted since 1936

² *Annual Report of the Tennessee Valley Authority for 1953*, Washington, D. C., Appendix, A 12.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 26.

⁴ *Ibid.*, A 5.

⁵ TVA in 1953 paid \$3.4 million to state and local governments out of total operating revenues amounting to \$104,887,869, a ratio of about 3.2 per cent. *Annual Report of TVA for 1953*, 24, A 12. The Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc., a privately owned firm, paid 21.2 per cent of operating revenues in state, local, and federal taxes. *Annual Report of the Public Service Company of Indiana, Inc.*, 1953.

⁶ *Annual Report of TVA for 1953*, A 10.

⁷ David Lilienthal, *TVA: Democracy on the March*, Harper, New York, 1944, p. 22.

amounts to \$51,266,000.⁸ This figure of course does not represent such intangible savings as improvement of land value, the saving of lives, general security and so forth. Chattanooga still suffers from annual floods, but TVA dams have so reduced the crest of the floods that the city can secure complete protection if it erects a system of levees.

Concomitant with flood control has been the improvement of navigation. In 1952, 797 million ton-miles of river traffic moved up and down the Tennessee and its tributaries. The problem of navigation is an important one for the Valley. Cheap and easy water transportation is one of the keys which is unlocking the mineral resources of the region. Between north Alabama and Virginia the land is like an underground vault, rich in extensive deposits of coal, iron ore, bauxite, limestone, phosphate, asphalt and copper. To make these natural riches available, a 630-mile navigation channel winds through the Valley.

Of great significance to the people of the Valley and to the nation is TVA's soil-improvement project. The chemical plants at Muscle Shoals are used to produce fertilizers for the benefit of the farmers. Over a twenty-year span TVA has produced 6 million tons of chemical fertilizers, of which approximately 4 million were distributed outside the Valley and 2 million within the Valley itself.⁹ TVA has introduced scientific farming through its demonstration farms. New farming methods and cheap fertilizer have contributed much to the agricultural progress of the Tennessee Valley.

The most publicized accomplishment of TVA is the production of electric power. With the power yield growing every year, TVA has become the greatest power plant in the nation. In 1953 over 23 billion kilowatt-hours were pro-

duced. The electricity is sold wholesale either to municipal power companies or to cooperatives which in turn distribute the power to individual farms, homes and factories. With the advent of electricity Tennessee farmers can do away with their kerosene lamps, can employ electric hay-driers, refrigerating machinery and other electrical devices. As was mentioned earlier, the backwardness of the Tennessee Valley had been appalling. In 1933 when the Authority stepped in, only three per cent of the farms had electricity, as compared with eleven per cent for the national farm average. By 1953 ninety per cent were electrified, which is the national average.¹⁰ Although much remains to be done, cheap electricity has been a major factor in raising the whole standard of living in the Valley.

Nor is the benefit of TVA power restricted to the Valley alone; during World War II TVA demonstrated its value to the nation as a whole. Its hydro-electric power was indispensable for the operation of aluminum plants which helped to turn out planes. TVA power plays no little part in the production of the atom bomb, for Oak Ridge and other bomb factories are supplied by TVA lines.

PRIVATE INDUSTRY

However, it cannot be forgotten that these achievements of TVA are only mile-stones along the way of progress for the people in the Valley. The broadest and most difficult of the objectives of TVA, the "economic and social well-being of the people," has been notably furthered by the above-mentioned achievements. Even the opponents of the TVA will not challenge its material successes. But they frequently claim that other Southern states which were as backward as Tennessee have made as much economic and social progress without any TVA.

⁸ *Annual Report of TVA for 1953*, p. 20.

⁹ *Ibid.*, A 36.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 25.

A task much greater than building dams and digging channels still confronts TVA. Has the basic problem been completely solved, namely, the cultural and material uplifting of a whole region by development of its resources? Building dams and planting forests are only preliminary steps to the real development of the Valley's potentialities by private industry. Tennessee is still a poor state, and TVA's job will not be finished until dams, scientific farming and transmission lines act as a key which will unlock the wealth of the region. Furthermore, only private enterprise can walk through the open door once the key has been turned. That is why TVA in recent years has been concerned about the expansion of industry in the Valley. Some industries are hesitant to settle in a locality where the source of their power is still a political and social experiment.

One of the most frequent and most disturbing charges levelled at TVA is that it is "creeping socialism." Amid the exaggerations of the hue and cry about socialism two facts stand out which, while not convicting TVA of socialism, nonetheless should give the prudent observer pause before rendering a blanket approval of TVA.

The first fact is that the government, through TVA, is in business in a big way, competing with private enterprise. Secondly, the entire economic and social life of the Tennessee watershed depends on TVA and ultimately on the government. Both of these facts fit somewhat awkwardly into the American tradition.

The question of socialism in regard to TVA should be considered with an eye for the future, rather than for TVA itself. As Wendell Willkie once remarked: "It doesn't matter what I think any more. You can't tear those dams down." TVA's proponents are fond of putting it on a pedestal as the model of future TVA's in the Missouri

Valley and elsewhere. Here the principle of subsidiarity should be carefully applied. Can private industry of itself develop the power needed in these districts, or that failing, can the state governments handle the task without having recourse to the federal government?

CONCLUSION

The TVA experiment deserves careful, dispassionate thinking on the part of all. It has been a progressive movement that has accomplished tremendous good in the Tennessee watershed. For that reason it enjoys widespread popularity and has many supporters. Perhaps TVA points to new horizons of social and economic progress.

On the other hand the fundamental ideas behind TVA, and not just its material success, must be considered in their full ramifications. Certain questions must be answered. First of all, does TVA contain an undesirable tendency to socialism? Is it the camel's nose under the tent?

Secondly, is TVA the financial success it claims to be? It is not clear that TVA could out-compete private utilities if it operated within the normal structure of business by paying taxes and interest.

Thirdly, do we want "TVA's" all over the country, or would it be more desirable to trust to private enterprise to supply the power needs of the nation? It seems dangerous to place in government hands such a vital productive factor as electric power.

In regard to TVA there is no place for such oversimplification as total approval or total condemnation. TVA is in that shifting twilight zone between a slower material progress with assured political and economic freedom and comparatively swift material accomplishments with the possible sacrifice of economic liberty. We must always walk ahead but where the light is poor, we must walk cautiously.

. . . but don't call it

CAPITALISM

BERNARD W. DEMPSEY, S.J.

IN THE quest for the content of a concept, a little nominalism is sometimes useful. If the concept has objective validity, determination of the time at which a term describing it emerged may be instructive. The method is a slippery one; it has its pitfalls and must be used judiciously, but it can be helpful and enlightening.

"Capital" as a fund of money or goods appears in the English language as early as 1611, with reappearances in 1630 and 1647. By the time of Adam Smith it seems to have been fairly current for what we now call working capital. By 1825, the content had sufficiently developed that McCullough could define capital as "the accumulation of the produce of previous labor, or as it is more commonly called capital or stock." The "capitalist" is the next term to materialize; in 1792 Arthur Young, the agricultural economist, in his *Travels in France*, speaks of "moneyed men or capitalists," but it is not until 1867 that we meet "the capitalist class."

"Capitalism" first appears, of all places, in Thackeray's novel, *The Newcomes*, in a passage of dubious economic reference. So not until 1877 in Douai's *Better Times* do we find capitalism in an unequivocal context, "This system of private capitalism is of comparatively recent origin," and we do not find the word again in English until the *Pall*

Mall Gazette for September 11, 1884, speaks of a "loophole for capitalism to creep in upon primitive Christian economics."¹ The *Communist Manifesto* (London, 1850) and other Marxian writings use "capital" constantly in a sense where today the abstract "capitalism" would be found as, "by bourgeoisie is meant the class of modern capitalists" or "bourgeoisie, i.e. capital."

Sombart put the period of "full capitalism" as 1740-1914, perhaps in deference to Marx's statement in 1848 that the rule of the bourgeoisie was then "of scarce one hundred years." Certainly persons in the land universally regarded as the native habitat of capitalism, who were writing vigorous English about enclosures, guild restrictions, mercantilism, foreign trade, joint stock companies, etc., before and after 1740, were aware that important economic changes were taking place. What they did not seem to be aware of (if it was there to be perceived) was that these changes followed a simple social principle that, with the system resulting, could be adequately summarized in one word.

This negative nominal argument yields no positive conclusion beyond the fact that prior to Marxism, it was not obvious to anybody else that "cap-

¹ All references, s. vv., *New English Dictionary*, Oxford, 1893.

² Karl Marx, *Capital*, Modern Library, New York, 1932, pp. 321, 328.

italism" was a good name for either the motive force behind the changes or for the system (if it be a system) resulting from the changes.

CAPITAL AS ECONOMIC CATEGORY

Capital, as a fund of either money or goods, was acknowledged almost as far back as the English language is recognizable. This is scarcely surprising since capital, as an economic factor, exists to some degree even in the most primitive economy. Eskimos have their kayaks and American Indians, their bows and arrows, neither of which was designed for direct consumption but both of which had great value and produced a standard of living higher than would be possible without them. If we accept these crude, observed facts as examples of true capital—and we must—we may define it provisionally as "produced means of production."

Yet an Eskimo economy is not what is meant by capitalism. And at the opposite extreme, in a totally controlled communist economy, there is an enormous preoccupation with produced means of production. Until recent months, when the unrest revealed at Stalin's death gave the Russian consumer a small but much-needed break, no price was too high for an increase in capital. The brutal methods employed have produced an increase in Russia's capital, especially since military expansion requires the production of many goods of capital value apart from their military uses. Yet words lose all meaning if we apply to Soviet communism and Russian imperialism the term capitalism, though the production of capital has been perhaps their prime economic goal.

Though "produced means of production" is a sturdy working definition of capital, it is not without real difficulties and limitations. Conceivably a person in a near paradise could live wholly off the bounty of nature, but if he

consumed all that he gathered he could never improve his state. Improvement comes when he "produces" more than he consumes and saves the rest. Saving therefore is a condition of capital formation,^a but the fulfillment of that condition results in nothing final. Unless things can be saved and no capital formation eventuate; things useful for consumption can be saved only to spoil if something further is not present to make them capital goods. Saving may be necessary to capital formation, but it is not in principle sufficient.

There are important cases where *additional* saving does not seem to be necessary to increase output. If our Eskimo with his kayak learns in some fashion that he catches twice as many fish by working in the morning rather than in the evening or going upstream instead of down, his output is doubled. The natural resources are the same; let us suppose the labor to be the same. Whence the increased output? Knowledge is capital of a sort. Or in a highly complex economy, let us suppose that a chemist, by merely changing the sequence in which the same operations are performed, eliminates costly waste or saves valuable time to the equivalent of a fifty per cent increase in output. The value of the capital goods involved will increase accordingly, but has "capital" increased?

MONEY AS CAPITAL

When accumulation (the necessary condition of capital formation) takes place in the form of money, the process is complicated. Saving by the con-

^a Much was formerly made of the fact that capital was necessary to support the worker during a period of production. On an extended project this is obviously true, but just as an isolated individual could spend part of his day on producing capital and part on producing consumer goods, so a community can divide its efforts between the production of consumer goods and producer goods and support the producer-goods workers out of current production without the need of any preexisting fund.

sumer now consists in restriction of consumption, refraining from the purchase of consumer goods and saving the money. In an efficient banking system, these sums will be lent at an appropriate rate of interest to borrowers who wish to buy materials for the production of capital goods. Money is borrowed, but materials are bought and sold. The effects, as Wicksell pointed out in a sweeping and brilliant insight, are different than if the goods were borrowed instead of bought and sold.⁴

Under modern conditions of credit creation, even apart from crude monetary inflation, money becomes the only thing of value which has a negligible cost of production. When money, which has almost no cost of production, is increasing in supply and consumers are saving, while goods, which have a cost of production, are constant or decreasing in supply, then the fact that money is borrowed but goods are bought and sold can become an explosive source of tension in the price system. The supply of money can be increased in a short time; the supply of goods cannot. The borrowed, created money can send the price of goods to any level.

Under the crude inflation which, however disguised, has become common in the two world wars and their intervening depression, this same process can become even more interesting. Consumers can be doing little or no saving, spending all their increasing money incomes in a vain attempt to maintain their standard of living. The state meantime creates money to commandeer more and more materials for capital formation. Here no one is saving, but resources are nevertheless preempted from consumption, and capital is formed.

There is no attempt here to outline a positive theory of capital, but only an attempt to indicate the elusiveness of

capital, considered strictly as an economic category. There can be no question of the reality or the weighty character of capital as an economic fact. Yet analysis reveals that it is as complex as it is weighty and as subtle as it is complex. These preliminaries are essential to a discussion of capitalism as a social system because capital as an economic factor must be a major element in capitalism as a social system. And if capital is not a simple concept, capitalism cannot be.

CAPITALISM AS SOCIAL SYSTEM

Werner Sombart is the economist who has devoted himself most exclusively and tenaciously to the study of modern capitalism. Since his problem was the description of a concrete society, his approach through genetic study of economic history, rather than abstract economic analysis, was defensible. Despite his notable labors and the assembly of many striking facts, his conclusions take us wholly out of the realm of economics. This is not necessarily a fatal objection: the economic situation at any time is not the product solely of the antecedent economic situation but of the *entire* antecedent situation. A change in educational policy in one generation, for example, may have notable economic effects in the next generation, though educational policy is not an economic datum in the first instance. Yet when Sombart reduces capitalism to a class society dominated by a "spirit" of acquisition, a "spirit" of competition and a "spirit" of rationality, it is hard to feel that anything very substantial has been uncovered.

The "rationality" is pure nineteenth-century positivist presumption that all men prior to the enlightenment were non-rational or irrational. Improvements in communication, including printing, made possible quicker as well as more accurate accounting of costs.

⁴ K. Wicksell, *Interest and Prices*, Macmillan, London, 1936.

But anyone who thinks that business rationality is distinctive of "modern" capitalism has never seen the rapid calculations of Middle Eastern merchants flourishing in their native air and has forgotten that chap (Luke 14, 28) who was the laughing stock of the neighborhood because "he did not first sit down and count the cost."

Mammon, or the spirit of acquisition, likewise cannot be regarded as an innovation of the nineteenth century. "The love of money is the root of all evil things," Paul warned Timothy, and if one agree that modern capitalism is an evil thing, the love of money may well be at the root of it. But it cannot be the distinguishing characteristic that sets capitalist society apart from all other systems.

Competition was different in the nineteenth century than it was before. The elder Toynbee indeed defined the so-called Industrial Revolution as nothing more or less than the market changes resultant upon the abolition of the market control exercised by the guilds. The competitive situation, heightened by improved transport and communication in both internal and foreign markets after the passing of the guilds, might indeed furnish grounds for calling the modern economic era the Competitive Society, but that need not be the same as capitalism—as any Stakhanovite can testify.

RELIGION NO EXPLANATION

Acquisition, rationality and competition in modern economics differ (if at all) only in degree from the same influences in other societies. Without some criterion to specify the point at which this degree produces capitalism and the previous society ceases to be something other than capitalism, these qualities and any similarly undefined combination of indeterminate degrees of them cannot be regarded as a definition of capitalism.

Much the same is to be said of the

"Protestant Ethic" analysis of Weber, Troeltsch and Tawney. The religious upheavals of the sixteenth century and their many later secondary movements produced social effects of commensurate consequence. In general, any social upheaval involves a redistribution of wealth, income and opportunity, even when it is not associated with anything so barefaced as the new politicians enriching themselves by appropriating monastic assets. Specifically in Northwestern Europe and in the British Isles, the religious revolutions, beside producing a "new rich," produced some unusual refugees. Families of wealth, education and wordly experience found themselves under pressure to move on or, if they stayed where they were, to vindicate their conduct and maintain or regain their standing. When "successful" people are hungry or feel called upon to make a fresh start and have the added motivation that what they are doing is done from adherence to radical religious principle, then things begin to move, things, for example, like the *Ark* and the *Dove* or the *Mayflower*.

No great acumen is required to explain the vigor of activity among certain groups of Protestant displaced persons. There was no more "rationality" in their actions than there is in the action of any man who is doing the best he can with high purpose: there was no more "vocation" than there is in the life of any Christian who says, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." That may be a great deal of vocation; but it was not new and it was not capitalistic. However, as we shall see, even if these elusive concepts could be shown to be valid, they might constitute a theory of the origin and social dynamics of modern industrial and commercial society, not a theory of capitalism.

We must deal with one author whose fundamental position is crystal clear.

Though the early Marx preferred "capital" to "capitalism" to describe "bourgeois society," there can be no question that the vogue of both the word and the idea supposedly lying behind it are both *post* Marx and *propter* Marx; it is "a term, if not coined, at least given wide currency by Marx."⁵ Capitalism to Marx was simple; any system of social economy which tolerated private property was capitalistic and therefore evil. In this sense, the theory of the communists may be summed up in the single sentence: Abolition of private property.⁶ Since labor was the sole source of value, and labor did not get the whole value, labor was robbed or exploited. Because wherever private property existed, labor was thus being robbed, class conflict was perennial, inevitable. "Property in its present form is based on the antagonism of capital and wage labor."⁷ To explain the obvious progressive character of the society he was criticising Marx had recourse to some Hegelian metaphysics to propel his "scientific" socialism, so the abolition of bourgeois private property, exploitation and class struggle are harnessed to the materialistic interpretation of history to give it the tempo of a revolutionary movement and to provide its "stages" and inevitability.

In addressing himself to the dynamic character of the nineteenth century, its technical progress, its distribution of income, its energy and enterprise (especially overseas), its proneness to crisis, Marx was asking good questions, which Ricardo and Mill had ignored. But he gave wrong answers to the right questions, and capitalism emerges from the Marxist movement not as a clear and consistent analysis of an economic society but as a battle cry.

⁵ T. S. Ashton, "The Treatment of Capitalism by Historians," in F. A. Hayek, ed., *Capitalism and the Historians*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1954, p. 58.

⁶ Marx, *op. cit.*, p. 335.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 336.

Capitalism to the Marxist is not an accurate picture of things as they are; it is the bloated caricature of a slimy monster to be crushed, even though its dimensions are not known with precision. Essentially it is a negative thing; it is what the Marxist is against. A military man may be concerned with detailed intelligence of his adversary; a social reformer need not be. All that is necessary for his purpose is to show that the adversary is bad. This Marx sought to do, and this is "the origin of modern capitalism."

SCIENTIFIC ESSAYS AT DEFINITION

Other writers, serious and competent economists not engaged in polemics, have sought to define capitalism in a genuinely objective way. The definitions of these students have much in common, and if capitalism can be defined or if capitalism is a good name for the thing actually defined, the work of one of these writers should provide us with the answer. Yet none of them has achieved wide acceptance, even though some of the authors are economists of considerable authority.

In a work described by von Nell-Breuning as "one of the few books on the subject that are of real value" Paul Jostock sets down the following as the essential notes of capitalism: 1. The system serves the purpose of gain by exchange; 2. production is regulated by the cooperation of two groups bound by contract, one of which possesses all necessary goods while the other possesses and contributes merely its personal labor; 3. the theoretical possibility that each of the two groups as an organizing factor engages the other and directs the course of production according to its own law is practically decided in favor of those possessing the capital.⁸

⁸ O. von Nell-Breuning, *Reorganization of Social Economy*, Bruce, Milwaukee, 1937, p. 270.

⁹ Paul Jostock, *Der Ausgang des Kapitalismus*, Munich, 1928, p. 6.

The first item cannot be a distinguishing characteristic of modern capitalism since it is true of any economy except the far extremes of primitive direct appropriation or complete totalitarianism. The crux of the matter is in the second point: the existence of these two groups and the manner and terms of their co-existence. If these two groups are well defined; if the differences in income between the bottom of the owning group and the top of the working group are sharp, so that capital accumulation through saving by the working group is negligible; if these income differences are buttressed by social custom, by educational, cultural and other opportunities so that transit from the working group to the owning group is difficult and rare, these conditions differ from Marx's only in the ethical view of property, not in the practical view.

CONDITIONS NOT VERIFIED

It is not enough that at any given moment a certain large number of people are working for wages under contract to others. The owning group must, as Jostock indicates, possess *all* necessary goods and the other must contribute *only* its labor. And if this arrangement is to merit the name of a system and is not merely a transient fact, these two groups must not only be well defined, so that only a negligible number of capitalists work and a negligible number of workers save, but the groups must remain well defined and remain so for some generations. Otherwise the statement merely says that at a given moment of time, you have such and such a distribution of wealth and income which is regarded as unsatisfactory but says nothing about how it got that way or why it is likely to stay that way.

In Europe and the British Isles where the inertia of feudal custom tends to

consecrate any status and where the master-servant relationship between employer and employee keeps the latter in a menial state, something like this may well be true. But in the United States, it does not seem to be true, and if the United States is not capitalistic, where can capitalism be found? Perhaps in New England and New York may be found a few small dynasties. But America's most typical industry grew up under the personal touch of Ford, Durant and Chrysler. In merchandising, Sears, Roebuck and Marshall Field all served time as "drummers," and Woolworth failed twice before his idea took hold. Our second largest corporation, Bell Telephone, was founded by one of the few inventors with business ability and has now 1,265,000 stockholders of whom fifty per cent own ten shares or less and whose average holding is 28. Much of our electrical industry, as well as a long list of inventions, dates back to and enriched a former telegraph operator named Edison.

Two things are to be observed about such a list: 1. the examples are drawn from very big businesses where capitalistic conditions should flourish if they do anywhere. Nothing is said about the large number of substantial businesses with annual sales of one to fifty million dollars whose founders are still alive. 2. Even the oldest of the persons named in the examples above lived and worked after Marx's theories were completed and widely circulated, when capitalism was supposed to be in its final crystallized form, with time the only additional ingredient necessary for it to shatter itself by its own internal stresses.

In the United States there are also about four million owner-operated farms of all sorts using about fifteen billion dollars worth of machinery, to say nothing of buildings and land. These owner-operators are largely out-

side any system by which an owning class contracts with a working class. Yet we can scarcely deny them an important role in giving tone to American society.

If a true proletariat, owning nothing, saving nothing, expecting nothing, were to settle to the bottom in any country, that country should be the United States. In addition to whatever "capitalism" is inherent in any industrial economy, the United States for decades admitted immigrants by the million and after 1924 by the half-million, and since 1937 (after a depression interlude) by the hundred thousands, not allowing for the recently authorized D. P. quotas. These immigrants were typically poor people with little education, not speaking the language of this country and many with European Marxist ideas, excellent raw material for a permanently submerged class. Between 1890 and 1910 the Pittsburgh steel area would have furnished all the data a Marxist needed to prove the imminence of the uprising of the proletariat. Today, some families then in a proletarian condition may still be so, but enough sons of the district have successfully played football for a university education (strictly a gentleman's prerogative) to obscure the class lines completely.

The labor union, the engine of the revolution, has not run on a Marxist schedule. The union itself is now big business, especially in the insurance field, supposedly one of the happiest hunting grounds for purest finance capitalism. The union executive now hires an extensive staff and lives and works much as the businessman. This is not a criticism of the union or the leader. Management of a large union today requires all the skills of the successful entrepreneur plus the common touch of the successful politician. When a union has found a man possessing that rare combination of qualities, it is only

commonsense to take good care of him and give him all the help he needs.

When Harold Ickes called Wendell Willkie a "simple, barefoot Wall Street lawyer," he was making a smart political sally. He was also summarizing the reasons why Jostock's essentials of capitalism are not found in the U. S.¹⁰

REALISTIC OBSERVATION

A current American writer of judicious temper, David McCord Wright, has insisted that in such discussions of a going economy we must be satisfied with *relative* notions of efficiency, productivity, success, equality. Marx could safely compare actual British industrial society with his ideal society. Adjustments in an ideal society are made more easily and less expensively than in a real one; a going economy should be appraised not against a philosopher's blueprint but against workable alternatives. Under these sensible conditions, Wright defines capitalism as any "system in which on the *average* much the *greater* portion of economic life and particularly of net investment is carried on by private (i.e. non-government) units under conditions of active and *substantially* free competition and avowedly at least under the incentive of a hope for profit."¹¹ The important relative expressions here may be fully justified in describing a going society, but the question of degree in a definition is also important. Capitalism here depends on two ratios, private investment to government investment, and monopoly (government or private)

¹⁰Messner, in a well-knit discussion says correctly that a satisfactory definition of capitalism "cannot be founded on ideological postulates but only on the findings of economic history and economic theory." His own choice, akin to Jostock's first point is "Capitalism is that form of social economy in which capital interest, i.e., the profit motive, is the primary driving force of the process." *Social Ethics*, Herder, St. Louis, 1949, p. 816.

¹¹David McCord Wright, *Capitalism*, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1951, p. 97. Emphasis added.

to competition. At what values of these ratios does capitalism become something else? What the definition actually defines is non-socialism. If capitalism and socialism form a complete disjunction, then I can define capitalism by framing words to exclude socialism. But if they are not, if socialism is a definite thing but capitalism isn't, if non-socialism admits of degrees which would be of greatest economic significance to persons living under the system, then why not let us say, *these are the characteristics of the American economy which works thus and so*. There is no particular reason for calling it capitalism.

One of the strong points of Marx's approach to modern industrial society was his realization of its dynamic and fluctuating nature, so different from the equilibrium picture with no possibility of overproduction painted by the "classics" whom he despised. "The bourgeoisie cannot exist without constantly revolutionizing the instruments of production and thereby the relations of production and with them the whole relations of society. . . . Constant revolutionizing of production, uninterrupted disturbance of all social conditions, everlasting uncertainty and agitation distinguish the bourgeois epoch from all earlier ones."¹² Here we have a genuine distinguishing mark of capitalism which might co-exist with private property and yield some intelligible interpretation of an era deserving the name capitalistic. Marx of course did not follow this lead except within the framework of his non-economic preconceptions. It is one of the places where he was asking the right questions.

ROLE OF CREDIT

Furnishing the right answer remained for the late Joseph A. Schumpeter, who stands supreme as a non-Marxian analyst of capitalism. He is one of the few writers who can take Marx's origi-

nal economic insights and use them without in any way becoming infected. By "our economic system, we mean an economic system characterized by private property (private initiative), by production for a market and by the phenomenon of credit, this phenomenon being the *differentia specifica* distinguishing the 'capitalist' system from other species historical or possible of the larger genus defined by the first two characteristics."¹³

Schumpeter in his classic *Theory of Economic Development* traces out the circular flow of incomes in an unchanging economy. With the passage of time under the influence of competition all values are correctly imputed to their actual sources. In such an economy, interest as a distinct and independent economic share disappears. There is no source from which it can flow. No one can profitably borrow \$100 and after twelve months pay back \$105 and not lose money by the transaction. Contracts in the form of interest payments may still be written and may still be economic in spite of the money loss. But the payments are not interest; they are transfers of wages and rents. In an economy which has had time to adjust itself perfectly to an accepted way of doing things, the rate of interest moves to zero; there is no relation between man and nature, land and labor from which it can spring as an independent and stable economic share. Into this serene, pedestrian economy, Schumpeter introduces the entrepreneur with his cost-reducing innovation financed by created credits. We have now a source of true profits from the cost-reducing innovation, and the profits are a source from which interest can be paid. Borrowing is now not only economic but also profitable in money for the entrepreneur. This

¹²*Op. cit.*, pp. 324ff.

¹³Joseph A. Schumpeter, "The Instability of Capitalism," *Economic Journal*, 38 (September, 1928) 361-86.

is the *differentia specifica* which defines modern capitalism.

Correct appraisal of Schumpeter's keen, illuminating analysis requires a correct perception of its relation to reality. In order to highlight the essentials, Schumpeter has stripped his argument down to a very abstract construction. Even in this abstract form, the picture is convincing, realistic and points the way to an understanding of much modern economic history. But as we approach actual economic life, alternative possibilities present themselves. Innovation and the entrepreneur have no essential connection with *created* credit. Entrepreneurs *could* borrow actual savings and still do business. Interest rates would be high, prices would be lower and perhaps less volatile, development would be less rapid, but crises would be fewer and milder and associated chiefly with abnormal events originating outside the economic system like drouths and war.

Because as a matter of fact, much sweeping innovation since the foundation of the Bank of England has been financed by created credit, Schumpeter was fully justified in the simplification and exaggeration involved in making created credit the *sole* means of financing innovation in his abstract construction. The memory of the "war millionaires" each conflict produces and the great acceleration of the rate of economic change under war-time inflation are all the facts we need to realize the legitimacy of his procedure.

There can be no question then of objecting either to Schumpeter's analysis or to his procedure. The question arises only as to whether this process deserves to be called capitalism. A system of 100 per cent reserve money or even a system of commercial banks for short-term credit with 100 per cent reserve with a system of equity banks for longer investment (provided the equity banks were mutual and the bene-

fits of created credit would accrue *pro rata* to all savers) would eliminate the obvious inequities and most of the cyclical fluctuations from the present "capitalistic" system. Either maintained for long enough would correct the most undesirable features of present income distribution. The fruits of saving accruing to the real savers would diffuse the ownership of investment goods and completely obscure the "class" distinctions by making interest an important item of income for large numbers of people.

John Hicks raised the question as to whether the "capitalistic era" was not simply a vast secular boom based on the great population increase that has characterized the same period of time. Schumpeter's analysis indicates that increased population was supported by the increased output which in its turn was made possible by the acceleration of investment with the forced savings of created credit. But if it is as simple as that, if correction of one aspect of the monetary and banking system would remove our economy from the capitalistic group, why should we call the whole thing capitalistic?

SYSTEM NOT CONDEMNED

Despite occasional strong statements as that of the Cardinals of France, September 8, 1949, that "the very essence of capitalism" is "the absolute value that it gives to property without reference to the common good or to the dignity of labor" and that there is in this "a materialism rejected by Christian teaching," the attitude of the Church is generally more guarded. Pius XI called attention to the fact that "Leo XIII's whole endeavor was to adjust this economic regime to the standards of true order. Whence it follows that the system itself is not to be condemned. And surely it is not vicious of its very nature."¹⁴ While

¹⁴*Quadragesimo Anno*, n. 101.

the word "capitalism" may occasionally appear in Catholic writings of high authority, the expression "present economic regime" or "contemporary economic system" is much more commonly used.

This example could fruitfully be followed. We have seen the variety of meanings that have been assigned to the term, and we have seen that none of them is compelling even when combined with superior analysis, as in Schumpeter. We have seen the variety of causes that have been assigned for the origin or rise of this undefinable something and none of these is compelling.

The answer is that there is no such thing as capitalism. The word is incapable of scientific definition; it exists only in the Marxist dream world. It should be used "only with great reluctance since it is largely a creation of [the] socialist interpretation of economic history."¹⁵ "Capitalism is what Marxists are against" is the only definition that will cover all cases. The term is no more than a socialist dirty word for use in the rough-house of agitation. Only a very foolish general accepts battle on terrain of his adversary's choice. But defenders of "capitalism" do just that when they undertake the defense of "capitalism" on Marx's terms. "Under the influence of Marxist propaganda, we have become accustomed to calling the economic system which during the last hundred years has spread across the realm of European-American civilization and thence across the whole world, 'capitalism.' For a multiplicity of reasons, this is an unfortunate habit."¹⁶

¹⁵F. A. Hayek, *Capitalism and the Historians*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1954, p. 15.

¹⁶Wilhelm Röpke, *The Social Crisis of Our Time*, Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1950, p. 100.

High on the list of this multiplicity of reasons must be placed the fact that such inadequate nomenclature is an obstacle to both action and thought. The social reformer who is taken in by the term and believes that by cutting the jugular vein of one dragon, all our economic ills will disappear, is going to be disappointed sooner or later when he finds out there is no dragon. More important, the student who believes there is one unique system to be studied is going to overlook important facts. Preoccupation with capitalism as an abstract concept has inhibited study (at least in Catholic circles) of institutions as they are. We have the institution of private property, a good thing but inadequately governed by social justice because that fertile notion has not been made operative. We have the institution of a market economy for goods and services, highly conditioned by monopoloid controls of both. Commutative justice is not always easy to observe in these markets even by him who is most anxious to do so. The institutions within the market are not organized with a built-in bent to make the promotion of the common good an easy thing while observing commutative justice. We have banking, monetary and fiscal institutions which facilitate the institutional usury by which the benefits of saving are swept to those who have not saved.

No matter where we are going we must start from where we are. These institutions should be studied as they are, and the relevant moral concepts must be studied as they can be applied to these institutions as they are. Enough good hard work on the economic and moral aspects of these problems can combine with recent technological progress to produce a really "good society." When that good society is achieved it really doesn't matter what it is called. But let's not call it capitalism.

EAST IS WEST

The Story of Our Japanese-Americans

JOHN E. BLEWETT, S.J.

WHEN we review the record of our largest Asian-derived minority, Americans of Japanese ancestry, we find that much of the story is unpleasant, but the brighter side is there too, for perhaps no single minority group in our country's long history has proved itself so loyally American. Cabots, Lodges, Roosevelts have written large sections of American history; Yamaguchis, Satos, Dois have written their own small chapter too—largely in suffering.¹

The height of Japanese immigration to America coincided with Japan's rise from a 250-year sleep and her subsequent thrust for power in Asia. Before 1900 the West looked with admiration on the Japanese drive to catch up with them. With nationalist imperialism, however, following the Russo-Japanese War, Western attitudes changed to apprehension. Unscarred from World War I, Japan in the 20's was depicted in the West, not as the land of Fujiyama and the kimono, but as the intruder, the rival, the foe. In the 30's as Japanese troops poured into Manchuria and overflowed into China, the

Western nations, especially the United States, waited in sullen fear. In 1941—war.

FACED PREJUDICE

Against this tempestuous background were set the lives of Japanese immigrants. First and second generation, alien and citizen, Japanese or English speaking—it made little difference to the average white American. All were more or less identified with Japan and suffered accordingly.

For three decades after her first treaty with the United States in 1854 Japan strenuously opposed emigration of her nationals as evidencing lack of patriotism.² In the first full decade (1890-1900) after the relaxation of this resistance about twelve times more Japanese migrated to the States than in the previous 35 years. Between 1900-10 the high-water mark was reached with close to 130,000 arriving.

Not all new arrivals took up permanent residence, however, for the total population in 1910 stood at only 72,157. This sharp divergence between number of *arrivals* and number of *residents* is partially accounted for by the desire of some to return to Japan rather than adapt to a new world, partially perhaps by inaccurate data in 1910 for the number of residents, partially by the Japanese practice after 1908 of bringing back immigrant laborers.³

² In 1886 the Hawaiian-Japanese Labor Convention incorporated Japan's official approval of immigration of her nationals.

³ H. A. Millis in *The Japanese Problem in the United States*, Macmillan, 1915, quotes

¹ In this article the following terms will be used frequently, always with the meaning here given:

- a) Issei (literally, first generation)—immigrants from Japan to the States.
- b) Nisei (literally, second generation)—direct descendants of Issei. Strictly speaking, only children of Issei are Nisei, but for the sake of simplicity all descendants will be so called.
- c) Japanese-Americans or Japanese-descent Americans—generic term including Issei and Nisei.

After 1908, the population increase, as shown in table 2, was almost exclusively by birth.

One interesting feature of immigration from 1900 to 1930 is the sharp rise in the number of women from 1910 to 1920. (Table 3) During early immigration years men considerably outnumber women, but the grossly abnormal disproportion of 63,070 men to 9,087 women in 1910 indicates the reluctance of Japanese families to break ancestral ties and set out for the unknown.

TABLE 1—JAPANESE IMMIGRANTS
ADMITTED, BY DECADES

Year	Total
1861-70	186
1871-80	149
1881-90	2,270
1891-00	25,942
1901-10	129,797
1911-20	83,837
1921-30	33,462
1931-40	1,948

Source: *Statistical Abstract of the United States*, 1946, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, p. 109.

TABLE 2—JAPANESE-DESCENT
POPULATION, BY DECADES

Year	Total	Year	Total
1870	55	1920	111,010
1880	148	1930	138,834
1890	2,039	1940	126,947
1900	24,326	1950	141,768
1910	72,157		

the *Japanese-American Yearbook* estimate of 91,958 with approval, pp. 1 and 24. In a letter to the then Secretary of State on the proposed Selective Immigration Act, Japanese Ambassador M. Hanihara on April 10, 1924, pointed out that according to official statistics "the total numbers of Japanese admitted to and departed from the Continental United States were respectively 120,317 and 111,636" from 1908 to 1923, *The Record of American Diplomacy*, J. Bartlett, ed., Knopf, New York, 1947, p. 428.

TABLE 3—SEX OF JAPANESE-DESCENT
POPULATION, BY DECADES

	Men	Women
1870	47	8
1880	134	14
1890	1,780	259
1900	23,341	985
1910	63,070	9,087
1920	72,707	38,303
1930	81,771	57,063
1940	71,967	54,980
1950	76,649	65,119

TABLE 4—CHINESE-DESCENT
POPULATION, BY DECADES

Year	Total	Year	Total
1860	34,933	1910	71,531
1870	63,199	1920	61,639
1880	105,465	1930	74,954
1890	107,488	1940	77,504
1900	89,863	1950	117,629

The 1910-1920 decade brought streams of "picture brides," women agreeing in Japan to marry the man in the United States whose picture they were given. Largely by this means the ratio between men and women dropped from 7-1 to 2-1 between 1910 and 1920. West Coast whites became alarmed at these "exotic butterflies" and the growth of Japanese-American families that they promised. This alarm led Issei in California to petition the Japanese government in 1919 to stop issuing passports to "picture brides." A few months later, in 1920, Japan agreed. Although this "Ladies' Agreement" between the United States and Japan in 1920 slackened the trend considerably, the imbalance continued to decrease until in 1950 there were 100 women for every 117 men.

If the Japanese had landed in the East, they might have had a fighting chance to establish themselves and gradually win at least the respect, if not the love, of Occidental neighbors. In California, however, where most of

them settled,⁴ and along the West Coast in general, anti-Oriental agitation had preceded them. Since the 1850's Chinese immigrants had experienced recurrent explosions of racial bias. Although Chinese immigration

After All, One World

... The moment will come, perhaps sooner than people think, when both sides will realize that, all things considered, there is only one way of getting out of the meshes in which war and hate have wrapped the world—the genuine recognition of human solidarity, a truth too long forgotten.

Pius XII, 1944 Christmas Message.

was cut off by the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, the thousands who had arrived prior to that time were given to understand, especially by discriminatory laws, that they would be doing California a favor by leaving. Table 4 shows how effective the Exclusion Act was—from the racist viewpoint. It was revoked in 1943.

As the Japanese increased in California, they began to inherit white anti-Chinese prejudice. On May 7, 1900, the first broadside in the "California-Japanese War" was fired at a mass meeting in San Francisco, sponsored by the local Labor Council.⁵ The chief speaker, Dr. Edward Ross, professor at Stanford University, blackballed the Japanese immigrants as unassimilable, inimical to white laborers' interests and lacking political feeling for America.

Many incoming Japanese, it is safe to say, were not overly anxious to take

up permanent residence. Transplants into a hostile people, they were as anxious to return to Japan as Professor Ross was to have them go, but that initial desire soon flickered out. An Issei woman, on the occasion of her naturalization in Denver in 1953, poignantly summed up her sentiments and those of many other early immigrants.⁶

We came, my husband and I, to work hard for a few years and to make money so that we would be able to buy a farm in Japan. . . . Then the children came and we worked harder. The house was filled with their noise and their laughter and we began to forget why we had come. When we did think of it, we found we could not leave and abandon the children. This was their country and they spoke its language We realized, too, that there was more of our lives in this America than we had left in Japan. This was our country too

Had Japanese immigration been merely a domestic issue, the national government might have overlooked it. Its international implications, however, quickly roused Washington to action. The federal government could not allow California unreasonably to complicate diplomatic relations with Tokyo by discriminating against Japanese immigrants, practically all of them perforce aliens. Washington's moderating influence was most conspicuous in the notorious San Francisco affair.

SCHOOLS SEGREGATED

On October 11, 1906, the school board ordered all Oriental students to attend a segregated Chinatown school. Though less than 100 Japanese children were affected, the Japanese colony balked at the order and were solidly backed by Japanese public opinion. President Roosevelt, who had recently mediated the end of the Russo-Japanese

⁴ From 1910 to 1940 concentration of Japanese-Americans in California rose from 57 per cent to almost 74 per cent of the entire number in the country.

⁵ Carey McWilliams, *Prejudice, Japanese-Americans: Symbol of Racial Intolerance*, Little, Brown, Boston, 1944, pp. 16-17.

⁶ *Pacific Citizen*, Dec. 18, 1953, Sec. A., p. 6.

War, denounced the board and urged Congress to qualify Japanese as citizens.⁷

He finally obtained abrogation of the order in exchange for a promise to negotiate a suspension of immigration from Japan. This resulted in the Gentlemen's Agreement, January, 1908. This agreement, with full terms kept secret, was "... an understanding ... by which the Japanese Government voluntarily undertook to adopt and enforce certain administrative measures designed to check the emigration to the United States of Japanese laborers."⁸ Roosevelt was probably the winner in that the U.S. Supreme Court of that day would probably have upheld the segregation order. The Gentlemen's Agreement, in turn, probably averted legislation excluding Japanese.

Settling in the United States at an unfavorable time among the most hostile part of the population, the Japanese suffered from another disqualification — their own industriousness. Though a sizeable proportion of the immigrants sluiced into lumbering, fishing, mining and canning, the larger part turned to the land.⁹ By 1909 almost 40,000 of the incomers were farming, chiefly as tenants of whites.

EXCLUDED FROM LAND

Agitation against Japanese land-owning quickly brought legislation. In 1909 and 1911 bills were introduced in the legislature to prevent Japanese aliens from owning land or releasing it for more than three years. Both failed of

passage, largely because of federal intervention. An ironic note was introduced when in May, 1910, a report on Japanese in farming favorably appraised their contribution to developing California agriculture. The Senate publicly reprimanded the Commissioner and took steps to prevent the publication of his report.¹⁰ The legislature passed its notorious Alien Land Law in 1913. The law's motivation was spelled out by one of its authors, U. S. Webb, then Attorney General of California, in a speech:

The fundamental basis of all legislation upon this subject, State and Federal, has been, and is, race undesirability. It is unimportant and foreign to the question under discussion whether a particular race is inferior. The simple and single question is, is the race desirable They [the Japanese] will not come in large numbers and long abide with us if they may not acquire land¹¹

This did not explicitly single out the Japanese. It declared that aliens, "ineligible for citizenship," could not rent land for farming for more than three years and that land already in their possession could not be sold or willed to other aliens of the same class. Since the Japanese alien, unlike the European, was "ineligible for citizenship," he was caught by the law. In 1920 by a three to one margin the California citizenry in an initiative measure tightened the earlier act by outlawing three-year leases; in 1923 even cropping contracts were banned. Though many Issei circumvented the law by buying property in the name of their citizen sons, it remained on the books and, as occasion offered, was used in an effort to dispossess them.

The Alien Land Law could never have been enacted if Issei, like European immigrants, had been eligible for

⁷ The Japanese government had contributed \$250,000 to San Francisco after the disastrous earthquake of April, 1906. This made the insult of the school board even less understandable.

⁸ Ambassador M. Hanihara's description in his letter of April 10, 1924, Bartlett, *op. cit.*, p. 427.

⁹ This estimate of the Immigration Commission is quoted with approval by Yamato Ichihashi, *Japanese in the United States*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1932, p. 163.

¹⁰ Cf. H. A. Millis, *op. cit.*, pp. 126-27 for details.

¹¹ Ichihashi, *op. cit.*, p. 262.

citizenship. Since their exclusion, together with its consequences, cut their own and their children's sensibilities deeply and tore the heart out of Washington's official declarations of good will toward Japan, a close scrutiny of this matter seems needed. How is the exclusion of the Issei (and the Chinese, for that matter) from citizenship to be explained?

In the Naturalization Act of 1790 Congress stipulated that under specified conditions all "free white" aliens could be admitted to citizenship. The operative term, "free white," was used, it would seem, to exclude Negroes, Indians and white slaves. In 1870 Negroes were included among those eligible for citizenship. The term, "free white," however, was not dropped, for it served the purposes of West Coast senators insistent on barring Chinese from citizenship.¹²

CITIZENSHIP DENIED

In 1882 in the Chinese Exclusion Act Congress enacted, "That hereafter no . . . court . . . shall admit Chinese to citizenship; and all laws in conflict with this act are hereby repealed."¹³ Chinese children born here of alien parents were not deprived of their citizenship by the Exclusion Act, and in *United States v. Wong Kim Ark* this was upheld by the Supreme Court.¹⁴ Citizenship, based on *jus soli*, was assured to Chinese and Japanese children born in the United States of alien parents.

No law or high court decision expressly refusing naturalization to Japanese immigrants existed in 1913 when the Alien Land Law was passed. However, it seems to have been commonly assumed that naturalization would be

denied, though certain lower courts upheld the opposite. The Issei, understandably enough, were reluctant to bring a test case before the California courts while the Japanese consuls, perhaps preferring to keep the issue alive for propaganda purposes in Japan, did not urge the matter.¹⁵

In November, 1922, the long-postponed decision on the matter was handed down.¹⁶ Unanimously, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that Takao Ozawa, applicant for citizenship, was not eligible, because he was not a "free white" person. Justice Sutherland pointed out that "white" was to be interpreted as a racial, not a color, test. In 1924 in *Toyota v. United States* this opinion was confirmed.¹⁷ The appellant, Toyota, a Japanese, gave proof that he had served in the American armed forces during the war, after establishing his residence here in 1913. He claimed naturalization rights in virtue of a Congressional act of 1918 granting such rights to all aliens serving in the forces. His petition was denied on the grounds that the Congressional Act did not intend to include aliens ineligible in virtue of the 1790 Naturalization Act.

The Ozawa and Toyota decisions were resented widely in Japan as conclusive evidence of America's racial bigotry and international callousness. The Selective Immigration Act in May, 1924, aggravated the situation. In establishing immigration quotas, Congress stipulated that "No alien ineligible to citizenship shall be admitted to the United States. . . ."¹⁸ The import of this sentence was not lost on Congress, for Secretary of State Charles E.

¹²Milton R. Konvitz, *The Alien and the Asiatic in American Law*, Cornell University Press, Ithaca, N. Y., 1946, p. 83.

¹³Section 14 of the Chinese Exclusion Act. Text in Bartlett, *op. cit.*, p. 424.

¹⁴169 U. S. 649, 1898.

¹⁵McWilliams, *op. cit.*, p. 66.

¹⁶260 U. S. 178, 1922.

¹⁷268 U. S. 402, 1924.

¹⁸Selective Immigration Act of 1924, Section 12(b).

Hughes strongly urged that it be struck out.

The practical effect of Section 12 (b) is to single out Japanese immigrants for exclusion. The Japanese are a sensitive people, and unquestionably would regard such a legislative enactment as fixing a stigma on them . . . I believe such legislative action would largely undo the work of the Washington Conference on Limitation of Armament, which so greatly improved our relations with Japan.¹⁹

Hughes pointed out that if Japan were given a quota on the same basis as other nations only 246 Japanese immigrants would be entitled to enter annually. He stressed that the Gentlemen's Agreement of 1908 was being carried out and insured a greater control over immigrants than legislation could insure. Despite these warnings, however, Congress chose to include the infuriating provision.

The Japanese Ambassador to the United States, M. Hanihara, in a letter to Hughes shortly before passage of the bill, pointedly summarized Japan's feelings.

To Japan the question is not one of expediency, but of principle . . . The important question is whether Japan as a nation is or is not entitled to the proper respect and consideration of other nations . . .²⁰

The Immigration Act marked the boiling point of pre-war legislative activity directly or indirectly concerned with Japanese-Americans. However, white American resentment against Issei and Nisei rose as Imperial armies debouched into Manchuria and China. A Nisei woman in a recently published autobiography realistically sketches the situation during the thirties.

Gradually I learned in many other ways of the terrible curse that went with having Japanese blood. As the nations

went, so went the people. . . . The editorial sections of the newspapers and magazines were plastered with cartoons of hideous-looking Japanese When stories about the Japanese Army on the other side of the Pacific appeared in the newspapers, people stared suspiciously at us on the streets. I felt their resentment in a hundred ways—the way a saleswoman in a large department store never saw me waiting at the counter. After ten minutes, I had to walk quietly away as if nothing had happened. A passenger sitting across the aisle in a streetcar would stare at me coldly.²¹

The uneasiness and discomfort of the Japanese-Americans is reflected by the population figures of 1930 and 1940: 138,834 and 126,947. This decrease of nearly 12,000 contrasts with the increase of over 27,000 the previous decade. Issei, unwilling to accept a citizenless future, and even some Nisei, hopeful that their talents could be more advantageously used in Japan than in color-conscious America, left the United States.

EXCLUSION ORDERS

After Pearl Harbor, Issei and Nisei along the West Coast, some 112,000, were caught in a web of fear.²² FBI men broke into their houses and in a few hours locked up nearly 1,300 Issei. Shortly, all enemy aliens (the Issei were such, because they had been *refused* citizenship) were ordered to surrender radio transmitters, short-wave sets, cameras and arms. On January 14, all enemy aliens were ordered to re-register with the government. On January 29, it was announced that all enemy aliens would be removed from vital areas in San Francisco and Los

²¹Monica Sone, *Nisei Daughter*, Little, Brown, Boston, 1953. pp. 118-19.

²²The details of this paragraph are taken from *The Case for the Nisei*, a brief of the Japanese American Citizens League submitted to the Supreme Court in the Korematsu case, pp. 39 ff.

¹⁹Bartlett, *op. cit.*, p. 425 for text.

²⁰Bartlett, *op. cit.*, p. 428 for text.

Angeles. Soon other areas were declared prohibited zones.

On February 14, 1942, General John L. DeWitt, commander of the Western Defense Command, submitted a memorandum to the Secretary of War asking for authority for the "Evacuation of Japanese and Other Subversive Persons from the Pacific Coast."²⁸ (Emphasis added.) The General made it clear that in his mind there was no distinction between citizen and alien of Japanese descent.

In the war in which we are now engaged racial affinities are not severed by migration. The Japanese race is an enemy race and while many second- and third-generation Japanese born on American soil, possessed of U. S. citizenship, have become Americanized, the racial strains are undiluted.

General DeWitt, by Executive Order No. 9066, February 19, 1942, swept West Coast states and parts of Arizona of the racially tainted. By August all persons of Japanese descent in the area affected were behind barbed wire in assembly centers. By November they had been herded further inland into relocation centers in eastern California, Arizona, Idaho, Utah, Wyoming, Colorado and Arkansas. Over 110,000 men, women and children, about 65 per cent citizens, were included. Some were imprisoned for several months, some for the duration of the war.

The bitterness this evacuation aroused in the Nisei especially, many of them college graduates and fully aware of its injustice, can be gauged from the following acid comment.

I had read in the papers that the Japanese from the state of Washington would be taken to a camp in Puyallup, on the state fairgrounds. The article apologetically assured the public that the camp would be temporary and that the Jap-

anese would be removed from the fairgrounds and parking lots in time for the opening of the annual State Fair. It neglected to say where we might be at the time when those fine breeds of Holstein cattle and Yorkshire hogs would be proudly wearing their blue satin ribbons.²⁴

It is sometimes advanced in justification of the evacuation of the Japanese-Americans that time did not permit sifting disloyal elements from the loyal, that this unprecedented step was the only means of meeting an unprecedented danger.²⁵ It seems, however, to have been clear to responsible authorities by mid-February, 1942, that the danger in question was manufactured chiefly by super-patriots and racists.

It was widely charged and more widely repeated in the early weeks of 1942 that the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor had been greatly aided by people of Japanese ancestry in Hawaii, a group that formed 38 per cent of the total population. The evidence, however, even at that early date, was to the contrary.

NO SABOTAGE

Martial law had been proclaimed in Hawaii immediately after the attack on Pearl Harbor. General Delos Emmons used all means at his disposal to quiet any irrational alarm about the Japanese-descent Hawaiians and gave point to his own belief in their loyalty by stationing them as guards over vital points. These facts were reported in

²⁴Sone, *op.cit.*, pp. 160-61.

²⁵Justice Frank Murphy in his dissent in the Korematsu case, to be considered later, riddled the "time was of the essence" argument as follows: "... Nearly four months elapsed after Pearl Harbor before the first exclusion order was issued; and the last of these 'subversive' persons was not actually removed until almost eleven months had elapsed. Leisure and deliberation seem to have been more of the essence than speed. And the fact that conditions were not such as to warrant a declaration of military law adds strength to the belief that the factors of time and military necessity were not as urgent as they have been represented to be."

²⁸General John L. DeWitt, *Final Report: Japanese Evacuation from the West Coast, 1942*, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1943, p. 34.

an interview with a noted authority on February 4. The following day an account of this interview was reprinted in the *California Daily News*.²⁶

On March 14 the Chief of Police of Honolulu cabled to the Congressional Committee Investigating National Defense Migration, then in California, that no sabotage had occurred before, during or after Pearl Harbor.²⁷

Since it was only on March 2, 1942, almost *three months after Pearl Harbor*, that the first evacuation order was issued, the argument that military necessity demanded hasty action loses its edge. If during that period no Issei or Nisei saboteurs had imperiled the West Coast Command, it seems quite naive to have expected trouble later.

The deeper one burrows into General DeWitt's *Final Report: Japanese Evacuation from the West Coast* and the more one reads around the subject, the deeper becomes the suspicion that the "military necessity" argument for evacuation lacks logic.

CALLED TO SERVICE

Early in 1943 the relocation centers were thrown into hubbub when volunteers for the Army were called for. The high-sounding words of President Roosevelt on the citizen's right to soldier for his country must have sounded ironical and hollow as they were read throughout the camps.²⁸

No loyal citizen of the United States should be denied the democratic right to exercise the responsibilities of his citizenship, regardless of his ancestry. The principle on which this country was founded and by which it has always been governed is that Americanism is a matter

of the mind and the heart . . . (Emphasis added.)

Whatever their views on the proclamation the Nisei eligible for the Army responded nobly. The famed 442nd Infantry Regiment, composed of volunteers from the internment camps and from Hawaii, won nation-wide acclaim by its fighting in Italy and France. One of the most heavily decorated units in the history of the American Army, it distinguished itself in another way too—no AWOL cases except for six men who left hospitals without leave in order to return to combat! Nisei numbering 33,200 served in World War II in one capacity or other.²⁹

The work of Issei and Nisei as instructors of Japanese in military language schools and as interpreters and translators during the long battle in the Pacific and the occupation of Japan could have been done by no other segment of the population. In a recent book by Colonel Sidney Mashbir, wartime commander of the Allied Translator and Interpreter Section, the role of the Nisei is underscored as follows:

At a highly conservative estimate, thousands of American lives were preserved and millions of dollars of matériel were saved as a result of their contribution to the war effort. It should be realized, also, that this group of men had more to lose than any other participating in the war in the Pacific. Had any of them been captured, their torture would have been indescribable.³⁰

Three U.S. Supreme Court cases tested the constitutionality of three distinct measures taken by General DeWitt. In *Hirabayashi v. United States*³¹ a curfew order was contested; in

²⁶*The Case for the Nisei*, p. 104.

²⁷*Myths and Facts About the Japanese Americans*, Department of the Interior, War Relocation Authority, Washington, D.C., June, 1945, p. 22.

²⁸*Facts About Japanese Americans*, American Council on Race Relations, Chicago, 1946, p. 26.

²⁹See *Special Groups, Monograph No. 10*, Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1953, *passim* for details relating to Nisei in the army.

³⁰Colonel Sidney Mashbir, *I Was An American Spy*, Vantage Press, New York, 1954, p. 242.

³¹320 U.S. 81, 1943.

Korematsu v. United States,³² the exclusion order; in *Ex parte Endo*,³³ detainment in relocation camps.

Hirabayashi, a Nisei, convicted for violating a curfew order, contended that the order should have affected all citizens within the area. The Court upheld conviction in view of the "facts and circumstances considered in the particular war setting." Korematsu, an admittedly loyal Nisei, opposed exclusion from San Leandro, his home. Conviction was upheld as "pressing public necessity." Justice Murphy's vigorous dissent denied that there was any reasonable relation between the exclusion order and "the removal of the dangers of invasion, sabotage and espionage."

General DeWitt in his *Final Report* had tarred all individuals of Japanese descent as "subversive." He found warrant for this charge in the following reasons: dual citizenship of some Nisei; previous existence of Japanese-language schools for Nisei; religious views of Japanese-Americans; education of some Nisei in Japan; residence of many near strategic points along the Coast; danger of mob violence to all of Japanese descent. Justice Murphy's biting appraisal rejected these "reasons."

The reasons appear, instead, to be largely an accumulation of much of the misinformation, half-truths and insinuations that for years have been directed against Japanese-Americans by people with racial and economic prejudices A military judgment based upon such racial and sociological considerations is not entitled to the great weight ordinarily given the judgments based upon strictly military considerations. Especially is this so when every charge relative to race, religion, culture, geographical location and legal and economic status has been substantially discredited by independent studies made by

experts in these matters.

The Nisei won the third case. Miss Mitsuye Endo was unanimously sustained in her contention that her *detainment* in a relocation center was unconstitutional. Justice Douglas in his opinion for the Court stated that, "When the power to detain is derived from the power to protect the war effort against espionage and sabotage, detention which has no relationship to that objective is unauthorized."

This decision helped to speed resettlement which, under the War Relocation Authority, had begun in 1943. As Army volunteers streamed from the camps during 1943, they were increasingly accompanied by Nisei, cleared for work in civilian life or college. Since the West Coast remained closed for almost all until January 2, 1945, those released headed eastward. For the large majority it was a new experience, for they moved into a world where they were no longer looked on as a racial bloc, but as individuals to stand or fall on their own merits. America no longer meant the West Coast but the mid-West, East and South.

Most of those in the camps at termination of the exclusion ban in January, 1945, went to their old homes. About 23,000 went west and by January, 1946, it was estimated that 43,000 had returned to California. The accompanying table shows, however, that the Japanese-American population in 1950 was not nearly so concentrated as in pre-war days.

TABLE 5—JAPANESE-DESCENT POPULATION BY REGION, 1940 AND 1950

	1940	1950
Total	126,947	141,768
Northeast	3,400	7,438
North Central	1,571	18,734
South	1,049	3,055
West	120,927	112,541

³²323 U.S. 214, 1944.

³³323 U.S. 283, 1944.

This distribution seems desirable from a sociological point of view for it continues to break down the in-group feeling of Issei and Nisei. Then too, social and economic opportunities denied them in pre-war days on the West Coast will be open in areas where they are accepted for what they are, outstanding citizens making a splendid contribution to American life.

Evacuees returning to the Pacific Coast were not welcomed with open arms. In November, 1944, the American Legion post of a small Oregon town indicated the ugly temper of some West Coast residents by erasing sixteen Nisei servicemen's names from the Community Honor Roll. (In April, 1952, it is only fair to add, this town's Veterans of Foreign Wars elected a Nisei as its commander.)³⁴ Within a few months 24 incidents of violence or open intimidation along the coast were recorded—fifteen shootings, four attempted dynamitings, three arson cases and five threatening visits. In 1945 the California legislature in a final spasm of unreason appropriated \$200,000 to investigate violations of the Alien Land Law after passing an amendment providing that the statutes of limitations would not apply to bar escheat proceedings.

Rising public opinion throughout the country helped to check this new racism. Perhaps most influential in dispelling antagonism to returning Japanese-Americans were the speaking tours of white officers of the 442nd Infantry Regiment. By telling fellow Californians the heroic showing of the Nisei, they put proponents of racism in the uncomfortable position of denouncing as unpatriotic the mothers and fathers of members of one of the most highly decorated units in the entire army.

In concluding this section on the war

Definition

Christian social action is influence brought to bear by the church or by a group of Christians upon social institutions and practices, for the purpose of giving men, women and children the best possible chance to live as God wants them to live.

HERMAN F. REISSIG, "Ways of Christian Social Action," *Social Action*, Feb., 1954.

and the relocation program, mention should be made of the signal cooperation of the Nisei in carrying out the evacuation program. Trained to respect for authority, to loyalty and cooperation, the overwhelming majority complied with the painful demands made on them, despite the fact that they looked on the evacuation program as a concession to racism.³⁵

An excerpt from a letter to his father by a Nisei, later killed in the war, hints at the mental struggle he and his fellow evacuees went through.

When Evacuation Day came, I was stricken with bitterness, and I could remember how you comforted me. I could not then understand why you tried to restore my faith in this country which was now rejecting us, making us penniless. You said wisely: 'It is for the best. For the good of many, a few must suffer. This is your sacrifice. Accept it as such and you will no longer be bitter.' I listened, and my bitterness left me. You, who had never been allowed citizenship, showed me its value. That I retained my faith and emerged a loyal American citizen, I owe to your understanding.³⁶

During the war Issei and Nisei proved their willingness to assume the obligations of citizens and resident aliens; since the war they have been striving to vindicate their rights: to compensation for war-time losses, rights of aliens to own land and the right of Issei to citizenship.

³⁴*Pacific Citizen*, April 26, 1952, p. 4.

³⁵McWilliams, *op. cit.*, p. 221.

³⁶Sone, *op. cit.*, p. 235.

More than 100,000 people are not marched out of their homes to centers far away without great economic distress. Each evacuee was allowed to carry the equivalent of three or four suitcases of bedding and clothing. All other possessions had to be stored, leased, sold or disposed of in some way.

During the hectic days following Pearl Harbor rumors of impending imprisonment began to fly through Japanese-American communities. Anxious housewives sacrificed valuable household possessions to second-hand dealers and accommodating vultures who saw the chance for a good bargain. For reasons beyond their control most of the evacuees were not able to avail themselves of storage space which the San Francisco Federal Reserve Bank, on authority from Washington, provided. Hence, they stored goods in private houses, church basements, meeting halls. During their absence millions of dollars in goods disappeared or were destroyed while local law-enforcement agencies looked the other way.⁸⁷

SUFFER HEAVY LOSSES

Over 200,000 acres of farm land, valued at \$280 an acre, were leased or sold before June 1, 1942. This land had produced crops in 1940 valued at over \$30 million.⁸⁸ More frequently than not, the terms of the leases were unfavorable to the evacuee, pressured as he was to dispose of his property quickly. Unable in the camps to check the accuracy of financial reports submitted by tenants or agents, many of the property owners were mulcted in different ways. While in the camps the evacuees were paid less than \$20

monthly for running and operating almost everything needed to keep life going. Many of those who did not have capital at their disposal were forced to drop life-insurance policies or sit by and see mortgaged property foreclosed.

Faced with these facts, Congress in July, 1948, passed the Japanese American Evacuation Claims Act authorizing the "Attorney General to adjudicate certain claims resulting from evacuation . . . under military orders."⁸⁹ Only claims of less than \$2,500 were admitted, in many instances a mere fraction of the loss sustained. An amendment of August 17, 1951, providing for compromise-settlements of claims, accelerated the program. By January, 1954, more than 20,000 claims had been settled for about 25 million dollars. In April, 1952, Justice Department officials stated that out of 23,000 claims submitted not one case of fraud had been uncovered and that in the 17,500 claims settled at that time the claimant had received an average of only 42c per \$1.00.

To settle 3,297 remaining claims, each for more than \$2,500, Representative Patrick Hillings of California introduced a bill on January 21, 1954, providing for compromise-settlements of between 50 and 75 per cent of the value claimed.⁹⁰ Since the total amount sought is more than \$68 million, Congress may move slowly. Congressman Hillings, however, strongly urged enactment of the bill "as a matter of fairness and good conscience" and because of the "patience and undefeated loyalty" of the claimants.

About six months before the Evacuation Claims Act was passed, the U.S. Supreme Court in *Oyama v. State of California*⁹¹ handed down a major decision bearing on California's Alien Land Law. In its decision, January

⁸⁷Details on the handling of evacuees' property can be found in a mimeographed *Statement in Support of H.R. 3999*, prepared by the Japanese American Citizens League, Section 3.

⁸⁸This evaluation was made by the regional director of the Farm Security Administration who handled the disposition of farm property. *Ibid.*

⁸⁹80th Congress, 2nd Session, Public Law 886.

⁹⁰83rd Cong., 2nd Session, H.R. 7435.

⁹¹29 Cal. 2d 164, 173 P 2d 794, 1946.

19, 1948, the Court, reversing the decision of the California Supreme Court, declared that, if a parent ineligible for citizenship because of race buys land in the name of his citizen son, it is unreasonable to demand that the son prove this is not done in violation of the Alien Land Law. Although the Court, four members dissenting, refused to invalidate the Land Law, it pulled its fangs by legalizing purchase of land in the name of a son. California recognized the implications of the decision by dropping some fifty escheat proceedings in progress.⁴²

Heartened by this decision, a Los Angeles Issei newspaper publisher, Sei Fujii, tested the Alien Land Law by purchasing a piece of property and commencing a disclaimer suit against the state. On April 23, 1950, the California District Court of Appeals reversed a lower court decision and declared the Land Act "untenable and unenforceable" because in conflict with the U.N. Charter.⁴³ This revolutionary decision was appealed to the State Supreme Court which, on April 17, 1952, unequivocally declared the Land Law unconstitutional as "obviously designed and administered as an instrument for effectuating racial discrimination."⁴⁴ A forty-year-old legal Frankenstein was dead.

Many people who objected to the McCarran-Walter Immigration Act must have wondered why the Japanese American Citizens League, speaking for Japanese-Americans generally, used all its vigor and resourcefulness in favor of the bill. Two reasons stand out: 1. the racial slur of the 1924 Act against Japan was taken back by giving her a quota; 2. refusal of naturalization on racial grounds was repudiated.⁴⁵ A path

was thus cleared for the naturalization of over 60,000 Issei in Hawaii and the United States.

Since the average age of the Issei now is 67, this lifting of the bar to citizenship comes in the sunset of their lives. Despite their age, however, they are poring over history books and polishing up their English in preparation for naturalization tests. It is estimated that over 2,000 were naturalized in 1953, while more than 10,000 are waiting to take their tests.⁴⁶ Although the immigration quota for Japan is only 185, more than 10,000 Japanese women have been admitted to the States since the war on a non-quota basis, almost all as "war brides."

In concluding this study, I would like to point out one of the most striking facts about the Nisei—their high level of education. Studies based on the 1950 census show that the median school years completed by the population at large was 9.3 as against 12.2 for the Nisei.⁴⁷ This concern for education reflects credit on both Issei parent and Nisei child and highlights one of the permanent values which Japanese-Americans emphasize—esteem for things of the spirit.⁴⁸

The Issei struggle to educate their children has been repaid, for in law, medicine, journalism, art, they have waged a successful battle against unjust laws and prejudice. If any group of Americans is self-made, it is that of Japanese descent. This fact should be stressed both at home and in Asia, for it is a proof that, though racism is not dead in the United States, it can be dealt mortal blows by those who will courageously and persistently use the democratic institutions available.

⁴²*Pacific Citizen*, April 19, 1952, p. 4.

⁴³38 Cal. 2d 718, 1952.

⁴⁴*See Pacific Citizen*, July 12, 1952, p. 1 for a résumé of the Masaoka case.

⁴⁵82nd Cong., 2nd Session, Public Law 414, Sec. 201 and Sec. 311.

⁴⁶*Nichibei Times*, Dec. 24, 1953, p. 1.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, p. 8., quoting Bulletin 3B, *Nonwhite Population by Race*, Series P-E, based on the 1950 Census.

⁴⁸*See George Minamiki, S.J., "Nisei and Japanese Students," SOCIAL ORDER*, 4 (February, 1954) 51-58.

A liberal journalist examines the record
of liberal social reform

Rendezvous with Destiny

DONALD McDONALD

ONE OF THE MOST exasperating, but important topics of critical discussion is liberalism. I do not refer to attacks on liberals and liberalism in certain areas of the diocesan press. Even so, the negativism of such attacks reflects, in their own barren way, the problem which concerns other minds on a higher plane.

I recall reading the peevish protest of a Catholic educator who conceded the innate politeness of secular liberals but complained that after talking with them he felt he and they had been using different languages. His patience exhausted, the educator dismissed all liberals as "pale men," a comment which prompted one appreciative, antiliberal diocesan editor to toss his hat in the air and to make the comment part of a lecture he was delivering and would publish in his newspaper. Now liberals' politeness is not the minor item some of us may think. Despite their deficiencies, most liberals are singularly free of uncharitableness.

The educator's despair is noteworthy for other, more essential, reasons. First, it illustrates that even large-minded, liberally educated, cultured men can be convinced it is fruitless to maintain contact and communication with secular liberals.

Second, by dismissing liberals as "pale men," exasperation has been permitted to obscure the social, political

and economic achievements of liberals and the abiding influence of liberalism. Need we point out how the specter of mass unemployment in 1954 haunts the Eisenhower administration to the extent that we are periodically assured there will be no laissez-fairism in *this* Republican regime, the federal government will intervene, decisively and swiftly. And we have witnessed the Administration's messages to Congress calling for expanded social security coverage, government re-insurance to support extension of private hospital and medical group-insurance plans, not to mention the President's use of the naughty word *liberalism* to help express his concept of government's relationship to the people. It is difficult to square all of this, I know, with the President's description of TVA as a form of "creeping socialism," but at least it looks more like an incongruity than a part of a deliberative political pattern.

LIBERAL REFORM

For more solid evidence that secular liberals should not only be countenanced but cooperated with, we have the book *Rendezvous with Destiny*, by Eric F. Goldman, a professor of history at Princeton University.¹ Mr.

¹ RENDEZVOUS WITH DESTINY: A History of Modern American Reform.—By Eric F. Goldman. Knopf, New York, 1952, 503 pp. \$5.00.

Goldman declares that the word *liberalism* is "headed toward semantic bedlam." As his book went to press, wrote Goldman, "Harry Truman, Robert Taft and Henry Wallace each describes himself as a true liberal." To evade this ambiguity, the author subtitled his book, "A History of Modern American Reform." But the ambiguity persists. Throughout his book Goldman interchanges the two terms, *liberalism* and *reform*, and in the latter third of his work *liberalism* and *liberals* succeed *social reform* and *reformers* as the generic term, object of almost exclusive attention.

Rendezvous with Destiny ends on a prophetic paean for liberals:

Every long-running trend indicates that the broad liberal path is the one in which most of the United States was finding its footing . . . The liberal can take strength from one tremendous fact. His is a momentous tradition, all the way from the pre-Civil War Jeffersonian aspirations to which he attached himself, down through the Prince Albert reform of Samuel Tilden and on to the sidewalk heresies of Harry Truman.

Aware not only of successive ambiguities of liberalism but also of its simultaneously disparate definitions, Goldman says that these "did nothing to diminish my conviction that it was worthwhile to study the movements which have led to the present importance of the word 'liberal' and to study them with a recognition that jumbles are often clarified by tying the present to its meaningful past." Mr. Goldman has done a great deal to clarify this jumble, but the jumble itself remains. This is one of the book's values: it brings into clearer focus the confusions of modern liberalism, the manifestations of those confusions—but not their root causes.

A more undiluted value, perhaps, is the historical explanation of institutions and spirit in the present social order.

Goldman has helped America to understand why it is what it is and to recognize her debt to the men and women, the liberals, who largely gave direction and momentum to social progress.

If Mr. Goldman has outlined the confusions of liberalism, he has also, without attempting to offer a philosophical explanation for them, outlined some of the basic inconsistencies and contradictions of liberals. Honesty, like politeness, seems to be one of the hallmarks of the liberal and Mr. Goldman is no exception. "I have always," he writes, "considered myself, in thought and in emotions, part of the 'liberal' tradition. I have also done my full share of wriggling in those liberal circles where discussion hurries from cliché to cliché, and clarion calls are conspicuously lacking in clarity."

SEE GOOD AND BAD

Goldman's work is as good as his implied promise. The work is not adequate, but I do not hold him altogether responsible for this. He wrote his book, "not so much to declare where we are going or ought to go but to present a narrative. . . ." But the inadequacy must be noted. And it must be recognized, not as a stick with which to beat secular liberals but as a stepping-stone to an understanding of both their strength and their weakness.

Too, the examination of the essential disability of secular liberalism is not entirely irrelevant to Mr. Goldman's book. Despite his disclaimer of any wish to draw morals, he virtually identifies himself with the liberals who found the "TVA idea . . . an exciting general formula for the future. Certainly the [TVA] concept, even if it did not completely solve liberalism's problems, contributed significantly toward the solutions."

And in the same concluding chapter, within thirteen pages, he complains twice about the postwar emergence of

"Catholic group-centrism," (Catholic activity on federal aid-to-education) which, if it does not indicate the direction the author desires liberalism to take, certainly indicates the direction he does *not* want it to take. He comments in this manner on one of the antidotes to such "minority chauvinisms:"

. . . Paul Blanshard, a one-time La-Guardia commissioner, published the first important liberal criticism of the way the Catholic hierarchy was functioning in the United States, his *American Freedom and Catholic Power*.

Since Mr. Goldman's is an interpretive narrative, he cannot extricate himself from the moral and philosophical elements of the facts he recounts. And one does not expect him to stand apart from his material. But if interpretation is one of the elements which makes *Rendezvous with Destiny* significant, it does so not only where it is penetrating but also where it is superficial.

* * *

I do not mean to imply that Goldman has singled out American Catholicism for criticism, or even that such criticism is more than a brief passing reference. Nor should one take the view that American Catholics are beyond criticism. Certainly Mr. Goldman is entitled to the position that federal aid to Catholic education is unwise or un-constitutional. But his evaluation of Mr. Blanshard's attack as an "important liberal criticism of the way the Catholic hierarchy [is] functioning" is questionable from any point of view.

It is understandable, though not entirely excusable, why Mr. Goldman should take a dim view of American Catholicism. The only American Catholic to receive favorable attention as a contributor to modern social reform is the late Msgr. John A. Ryan. On balance, I think he is right. What

other Catholic can we name, in the Ryan era, of comparable stature or impact? I think there are valid, extenuating reasons why American Catholicism has not been in the van of social reform in this country. But reasons explain; they do not change history.

All the same, Mr. Goldman might have spent as much time and devoted as much research to his final chapter as he evidently did on earlier parts. He might have found a few other things about Catholicism and social reform, in addition to "minority chauvinisms." The American Catholics' slowly but inexorably emergent understanding of the real meaning, for example, of the laity's role in political, economic, cultural and social action; the work of such organizations as the N.C.W.C. Social Action department, the Catholic Association for International Peace, the Industry Council Plan committee; men like the late Bishop Francis Haas, Msgr. L. G. Ligutti, Archbishop Robert Lucey, the staff of *America* and the *Commonweal*, indeed, the Institute of Social Order and its splendid studies.

* * *

Rendezvous with Destiny excels in its picture of social reform, from the Populists in the late 19th century to the Fair Deal of our own time. This picture, presented with skill and sensitivity, reveals modern man's creditors and places the present social order in its proper perspective. The two most exciting and best written sections are those describing 1. the reformers' breakthrough of the conservatives' "steel chain of ideas," in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, when conservatism of the worst kind, bulwarked by religious respectability and indisputable "scientific" fact, seemed impregnable and 2. the Roosevelt era, particularly the years from 1932 to the outbreak of World War II.

In the late 1890's, the progressives' "central argument that government should use centralized powers for reform," writes Goldman, "was repelled by closely linked conceptions of economics, religion, morals, psychology, biology, history, law and philosophy." Using all these concepts and giving to each a self-interested, absolute interpretation, conservatives fashioned their steel chain of ideas to perpetuate "rugged individualism," indifference, if not contempt, for social justice and responsibility to the common good.

CONSERVATIVE RESISTANCE

Darwin's theory of biological evolution was transferred whole to the social order in which, so the conservatives argued, it was inexorable that only the economically "fittest" would and should survive. Judges supported the almost exclusively economic interpretation of the Constitution as a capitalist bulwark. Conservatives, in addition to deifying their kind of Constitution, found "a final sanction for the status quo from God Himself."

Two doctrines drawn from the Christian tradition were especially emphasized: the concept of the individual as a free moral agent, and the doctrine that God has determined the success or failure of each of His children. . . . Men like James McCosh, president of Princeton University and power in Presbyterian circles, opposed social legislation on the grounds that God-given abilities were to be used freely and any attempt to interfere with their use was "theft."

Equally common was the emphasis of the famous New York preacher Henry Ward Beecher. "God has intended the great to be great and the little to be little," Beecher cried. If this meant that Henry Ward Beecher received forty thousand dollars a year and a laborer one dollar a day, there was no cause for whimpering at God's decisions. A dollar a day, Beecher explained, was not enough to "support a man and five children if a man would insist on smoking and drinking beer. . . . But the man who

cannot live on bread and water is not fit to live."

Then emerged Herbert Spencer, greeted exultantly by the magnates on his visit to the United States in 1882, applying biological Darwinism to social and economic life, furnishing conservatives (already outfitted with religious respectability) "all the authority of science." But Darwinism is a two-edged sword, and the reformers quickly found the other edge: being and reality, they said, are dynamic, changing, evolving; nothing, they argued, not even the present preeminence and power of the economic "fittest" is absolute. To this, the reformers added the most psychologically effective argument that many conservatives were motivated only by economic self-interest, a motivation which Americans—no matter how entangled with materialism—found repellent.

REFORM IMPETUS

Reform judges and churchmen, including Msgr. Ryan, completed what Henry George's *Progress and Poverty* had started. They severed conservatism's "steel chain of ideas" by showing, respectively, that Constitutional protection extended beyond the "propertied," and that the correlative of moral freedom in a polity is social responsibility. In this section, as on the Roosevelt reforms, Goldman displays extraordinary sensitivity to the human realities which alone gave, and still give, meaning to reform theories, trials and errors, and experimentation—bold and sometimes imprudent. Farm foreclosures in the thirties made not a statistic, but a group of angry farmers venting their fury upon a hapless judge who tried to carry out the law.

Goldman has a keen ear for the neatly characterizing phrase. "When somebody brought in [to Harry Hopkins] a plan that 'will work out in the long run,' Hopkins snapped: 'People don't

eat in the long run—they eat every day'." He is also adept at catching in a few deft lines, the product of great but not ostentatious research, the mood and social climate of the time, an art redeemed from glibness by its ring of authenticity.

Though Goldman approaches adulation of Franklin Roosevelt, he condemns his 1937 attempt to pack the Supreme Court. His "over-age argument was rendered completely evasive by the fact that the President's most consistent supporter on the Court was the eighty-year-old Louis Brandeis." More important his move against the Court had been seriously considered in 1936 but "was never publicly mentioned until the election was over."

Nor does Goldman evade some inherent fallacies which haunt many liberals: their fellow-traveling with communists (which John Haynes Holmes admits was a complete acceptance of the notion that the end justifies the means), their all but uncritical acceptance of centralized federal power, an acceptance which many liberals today are beginning to reassess—without forgetting the grim days of 1930 when government, local, state and federal, stood abjectly inactive.

APPEAL OF MARXISM

Eric Goldman suggests that communism's appeal among non-communist liberals stemmed from the party's militant defense of minority rights and from the depression-born conviction that "economic change" was paramount, that it was a goal which overrode all ethical considerations of means.

These suggestions, of course, do not penetrate to the philosophical and theological root of the secular liberal's predilection for the theories of Marxism, even when the brutality of their actualization evokes universal revulsion. The recent Christian Humanism symposium in SOCIAL ORDER, in the light of sin-

cere gropings by many secular liberals, here takes on its deepest significance as a massive contribution to uncovering the causes of liberalism's elemental error. Here, too, the article in 1949 by Bishop George A. Beck of England, "Retrospect on Liberalism," (included in the anthology, *The Catholic Mind Through 50 Years*) shows the causes and inevitable end of liberalism's presupposition of man's "natural perfectibility and his natural self-sufficiency," why it was logically and psychologically proper, within a secular liberal framework, to turn from Church to State, from clergy to laity, to repose so much liberty in the hands of governmental authority.

Eric Goldman's narrative trails off on a note of man's "natural perfectibility." "For almost a century the modern American reformer has been the gadfly and the conscience, to a large extent the heart and the mind, of the only nation in man's history which has dared to live by the credo that any individual's rendezvous with his destiny is a rendezvous with a better tomorrow."

* * *

What are the large, basic problems confronting social reform? The first, I believe, from the standpoint of secular liberalism itself, turns on the question whether there will be disillusion for liberals or a decisive confrontation with Christian humanism, in which freedom and authority are finally understood, destiny is rescued from merely vagrant, hopeful wandering, and other "social reform" problems are seen in focus, as part of a pattern large enough to accommodate the greatest humanly imaginable aspirations for responsible freedom.

These social-reform problems include:

Industry-wide economic planning by capital-management, labor and govern-

ment on a national (eventually international) level.

Actualization of what Pius XII has said is indispensable, an "effective political organization of the world."

Equitable distribution of the world's resources.

A rationally ordered international immigration policy which, recognizing that land has been created and given to mankind for the use of all, will progressively eradicate man-made, artificial barriers preventing access to relatively unused land-areas in the world.

The preservation of a pluralistically structured society with particular emphasis on preventing the extinction of the small, private liberal-arts colleges will seem to be tending dangerously to accept not only the financial aid of private industry but some of its questionable economic and social doctrines as well.

The grossly inadequate informational techniques and policies of the modern press which continues, wittingly or not, to drive downward the knowledge-level so crucial in a self-governing democracy.

INTERNATIONAL AREA

As we move deeper into the last half of the 20th, "thermo-nuclear," century, what are the major social, political and cultural problems most in need of reform?

I would say that, with due regard to the domestic issues already mentioned, the urgency and priority of social reform has clearly shifted, in the past ten years, to the international level:

The imbalance of world resources—both land and the fruit of the land, what the Catholic Association for International Peace calls our "embarrassing surpluses" of grain, for example, while whole nations reel from one malnourished generation to the next. Pope Pius XII said of this problem:

The contrast between wealth and poverty . . . is intolerable to the Christian conscience. . . . The problem is further aggravated by the new yearnings which have awakened in the minds of broad

masses a vivid realization of the inequalities existing between peoples. *Letter to Charles Flory, July, 1952.*

Secondly, the political and juridical vacuum in the international community which Pius XII sees "becoming established," the need for a world-wide juridical and political organization adequate to the *de facto* one-world in which, as Cardinal Suhard noted, "each of us depends upon all for the simple fact of survival." Of this need Pius XII recently declared:

The clear fact that relations between individuals of various nations, and between nations themselves, are growing in multiplicity and intensity makes daily more urgent a right ordering of international relations, both private and public; all the more so since this mutual drawing together is caused not only by vastly improved technological progress and by free choice, but also by the more profound action of an intrinsic law of development. This movement then is not to be repressed, but fostered and promoted. *To Italian Catholic Jurists, December 6, 1953.*

I look forward to future symposia in SOCIAL ORDER and hope some of them will zero in on a few of these matters.

If we owe so much of our social reform to post-Civil War liberals, and we do, the secular liberals themselves will be the first to admit, I believe, that the rendezvous with their destiny, if it is to preserve and advance the common good of society, must not, now, preclude self-critical questioning, not of their liberalism but of their secularism.

And if Eric Goldman's fine narrative serves no other purpose, it should convince a great many Catholics, otherwise inclined, that a spirit of charity and appreciation, not unthinking spite and arrogant derision, must be what the secular liberal finds as he searches for a philosophical if not a theological, point of reference.

TRENDS

Incomes Continue Rise

Income of consumer units continued to rise during 1953, according to a preliminary report of the Federal Reserve Board survey. The number of units in both the \$7,500 up to \$10,000 and the \$10,000 and over brackets increased by one per cent over the preceding year to six and five per cent, respectively. The number of units in the lowest bracket, under \$1,000, decreased by one per cent to ten. Income distribution for the past seven years is found in the following table:

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF CONSUMER UNITS, BY MONEY INCOME IN PRECEDING YEAR, 1948-54.¹

Consumer financial positions	1954	1953	1952	1951	1950	1949	1948
Under \$1,000	10	11	13	13	14	12	14
\$1,000 to \$1,999	13	14	15	17	19	18	22
\$2,000 to \$2,999	14	16	18	19	21	23	23
\$3,000 to \$3,999	16	18	18	19	19	20	17
\$4,000 to \$4,999	16	15	15	12	11	12	10
\$5,000 to \$7,499	20	17	14	14	11	10	9
\$7,500 to \$9,999	6	5	4	6	5	5	5
\$10,000 and over	5	4	3	6	5	5	5
All cases	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Source: *Federal Reserve Bulletin*, March, 1954.

¹ Preliminary data for 1954. Money income before taxes.

When it is recalled that the number of spending units is increasing annually by better than three per cent, it will be seen that the number in the lowest bracket has declined by only about a half-million. At the same time, the number in the upper two brackets is considerably larger than the increase from five to eleven per cent would at first seem to suggest.

Government in Business

A recent booklet published by the U. S. Chamber of Commerce examines the extent of government enterprise and reports that government competition is facing "airlines, bakeries, cemeteries, coffee roasters,

drycleaners, freight forwarders, motor vehicle repairers, ship builders, ship operators, retail grocers, rope manufacturers, tire retreaders, truckers, tug boat operators, warehouse operators, wooden box manufacturers and many others."

The Federal Reserve Board stated recently that government corporations and credit agencies hold a total of \$2.6 billion invested in government securities. They owned \$1.3 billion worth of commodities, supplies and materials, as well as land,

structures and equipment valued at \$3.2 billion and \$936 million in cash.

At the present time, the booklet continues, our national government is the "largest electric power producer, the largest insurer, the largest lender, the largest landlord, the largest tenant, the largest holder of timber and grazing land, the largest owner of grain, the largest warehouse operator, the largest shipowner, the largest truck fleet operator."

Co-op Growth

Between 1941 and 1951 the number of wholesale cooperatives (SOCIAL ORDER, 2

[February, 1952] 86) in the United States increased from twenty to 25, their volume of sales from \$172 million to \$810 million. Retail co-op sales are not comparable over the same period, but their volume has increased to a total of more than \$1.6 billion in 1950 which constituted more than .8 per cent of all retail sales. Credit union members amounted to 5,196,393 in 1951 and at the close of that year they held \$747,476,131 in outstanding loans. In 1951 there were 900 electricity cooperatives, serving almost four million consumer units.

Unemployment Aid Studies

The Unemployment Compensation program is likely to learn something about itself in 1954. The Bureau of Unemployment Security, in cooperation with the states, will make two sampling studies, one to determine the proportion of improper claimants, the other to determine the adequacy of benefits. The first will show whether the right persons are receiving benefits (whether beneficiaries meet legal requirements); the second, whether benefits received are the right ones (how benefits are spent and what other resources beneficiaries have).

Both investigations deal with matters basic to the program—why it is not more liberal than it is; on the other hand, why it is as liberal as it is, and, indeed, why there is any program at all. Typical of the birth and growth of welfare programs, this first attempt at getting adequate information comes after sixteen years of existence.

Unemployment Benefits

As unemployment continues high, attention is turned upon proposed changes in unemployment compensation. Plans outlined by the President include expansion of coverage, increase in size and duration of payments. Under the new proposals some 11.5 million additional workers would be covered. Of these, 3.4 million would be in small companies employing less than eight workers, 2.5 million would be those in federal-government employment, 500,000 are "individual contractors" and 200,000 are food processors. The remaining 4.5

million are state and municipal employees who must be included by local action.

To bring compensation up to the level of increased living costs the nation-wide maximum would be raised to about \$35 weekly, so that benefits would equal about half of factory base pay. The national average for compensations is now about \$23.50. And all workers would be eligible for a full 26 weeks of assistance. This is standard in many states now.

Human Relations Workshops

Two dozen workshops and seminars in human relations and intergroup education are already scheduled for 1954 summer sessions in American universities and colleges, according to a current roundup. Probably the number will approach last year's total of 29.

Five will be in Catholic institutions: Catholic University, University of Detroit, Loyola of Los Angeles, Marquette University and St. Louis University.

Leadership in some sessions and scholarship arrangements in all 24 are provided by the Commission on Educational Organizations of the National Conference of Christians and Jews.

Technicians on the Spot

The exchange of experts and the provision of training facilities to students which have been features of the Colombo Plan for manning the development projects of south and southeast Asia have so far provided 177 experts and training facilities for 1,145 students.

Sixty-nine of the experts have been made available to Ceylon itself, 45 to Pakistan, 39 to India, seventeen to the Federation of Malaya, four to North Borneo, two to Sarawak and one to Singapore.

Allotments for student training facilities go chiefly to India (352), Pakistan (281), Ceylon (268), Indonesia (76), Federation of Malaya (65) and Philippines (28). Six other lands receive 75 allotments.

In the recently issued annual report, emphasis was put on the need of middle and lower-grade technicians. Millions of them will be required as agricultural extension workers, teachers, engineers.

BOOKS

THE PROBLEM OF ABUSE IN UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS.—By Joseph M. Becker. Columbia University Press, New York, 1953, xiii, 412 pp. \$6.50.

Father Joseph M. Becker has made an intensive and most impressive study of abuse in unemployment benefits occurring during the reconversion period following World War II, a period in which conditions conducive to abuse probably were at the optimum that might reasonably be expected to exist. Bringing to that study a scientific attitude, a mature judgment and a high sense of moral values, he analyzed all available data on the problem and made extensive personal surveys of field operations as well. It is safe to say that his work will stand as a model for those who later on undertake similar studies.

No clear-cut conclusions of wide applicability respecting abuse resulted from the study. Unfortunately, adequate data on which to base such conclusions were not available. But much of the debris surrounding the subject has been cleared away, the framework to be studied was laid bare and much light was shed on the paths to be followed.

The "impression" which Father Becker got from his study of available data, and he permits himself no more than a marked impression, is that there was a fair amount of abuse during the reconversion period, more than need have been permitted to occur perhaps, but that the amount was not so large as to cast serious discredit upon the liberality of the laws or upon administrators or recipients as a whole. Nor does he find clear evidence that the payment of benefits, even of the liberal benefits paid to veterans, had a noticeable adverse effect on the rate of reconversion.

Father Becker's study lends considerable support to the idea that with proper legislative provisions designed to reduce the opportunities for abuse and adequate administrative efforts to police those provisions it is possible to provide unemploy-

ment benefits liberal enough to meet a substantial share of the needs of the unemployed.

DOMENICO GAGLIARDO
University of Kansas

STRUGGLE FOR AFRICA.—By Vernon Bartlett. Frederick A. Praeger, New York, 1953, ix, 246 pp. \$3.95.

Mr. Bartlett, English journalist and liberal parliamentarian, does his best to stand above all biases. He succeeds particularly well in the chapters devoted to South Africa: showing how the Reverend Malan does not even try to practice true *apartheid* which, according to his brand of Calvinism, is God's will for his country. South African whites, whatever their politics, want black labor for mining, farming, domestic service. Nationalists restrict their practical policy to petty but numberless acts of persecution, such as insisting that late at night, after a full day of hard work, domestic servants be sent to sleep in suburban locations, hours away from places of employment.

The author sees hope for better human relations in the policies of other areas, notably Belgian Congo and the British trust territory of Tanganyika. However, a more adequate treatment of the West African governments would have been welcome at this point. After all, the most convincing evidence we, for the time being, have of Africans' political abilities comes from the native statesmen who distinguished themselves in such successful experiences as the Gold Coast.

The treatment of religion is also inadequate—and not entirely free of Protestant bias. One big factor in the present situation is that in several parts of Africa more than half the native population is already Christian and practicing its religion—a higher proportion than in many Western countries. Due to ignorance of

such realities, Mr. Bartlett's testimony is likely to carry less weight than the sincerity of his position deserves. This good book would have lost nothing from being put on more scholarly foundations.

JEAN L. COMHAIRE
Seton Hall University

RUSSIA: WHAT NEXT?—By Isaac Deutscher. Oxford University Press, New York, ix, 230 pp. \$3.00.

Had Mr. Deutscher answered the question posed by his title immediately with, "We do not know, but let it be Marxian!" he would have saved valuable time. In summary, that is his thesis. Despite the many students who have found Marxian philosophy inadequate this "expert on Russian affairs" would put the blame for the unpleasantness of the communist experiment at Stalin's door only. The "*startling* [*italics mine*] changes . . . occurring in Moscow" almost immediately after Stalin's demise, indicated a change of heart to Mr. Deutscher. Whatever the lack of the Stalin era, it was gone. That Stalin is gone, apparently cannot be denied. However, the proposition that the extremes of Stalin were due to the man and not to the philosophy can be argued. Whether the interpretation of Marx was Lenin's, Stalin's, had been Trotsky's (and Mr. Deutscher favors Trotsky), or will be Malenkov's, the unreal and inhuman foundation was and is there for all of them to justify whatever course communism may take. Until that is acknowledged and disowned, no amount of speculation will justify the hope of a change for the better in the Soviet Union.

The real danger of the book to the unwary, besides its inconclusive speculation, lies in assumptions and understatements. Lenin and Stalin, according to Mr. Deutscher, were historical necessities. If we assume dialectic materialism as a fact, the assumption of historical necessity is valid. Then we can easily admit that Stalin was "a trend of the time" (p. 46) and not a heartless usurper; his achievement of bringing Russia from "plows to atomic piles" (p. 65) becomes great progress, despite the cost in human lives; the plan becomes the mark of success, despite the inclusion of millions for slave labor.

Here are some of the more salient understatements and misstatements: "Lenin was not a single-party man" (p. 25) does not sound so noble when opposed to his own public statement in 1921, "It matters not if three-fourths of the human race perish. What is important is that the remaining one-fourth be communist!" Such falsifications as: the opponents of Stalin "looked back longingly to the democratic origins of the Revolution" (p. 45), "Lenin did indeed infuse democracy into the bolshevik party" (p. 52), "Marxism has its inner logic and consistency; and its logic is modern through and through" (p. 61), slave labor is a negligible factor in the Soviet economy (p. 71), the bulk of the peasantry are adjusted to the collectives (pp. 78, 83, 124), even after liberation collectives and state planning would be necessary (pp. 86, 88), the revolutions of Tito and Mao-Tse-Tung were independent of Moscow (pp. 106-109), Stalin's expansion and foreign policy were forced upon him (p. 111), indicate with sufficient clarity the anti-Stalin (not too much, however) but pro-Marxist thesis of the book. Mr. Deutscher seizes on straws like the amnesty decree, the freeing of the "doctor conspirators" and the American visitor with a camera as indications of a return to the correct path. One might well ask whether or not the amnesty was due more to overcrowded jails than zeal for the rights of Soviet citizens and whether the absurdity of the "doctors' plot" was not abandoned for a better scapegoat, Lavrenti Beria himself.

WALTER C. JASKIEWICZ, S.J., Director
Institute of Contemporary
Russian Studies
Fordham University

IMPERIAL COMMUNISM.—By Anthony T. Bouscaren. Public Affairs Press, Washington, D. C., 1953, vii, 256 pp. \$3.75.

This informational volume presents a timely and coherent global survey and an appraisal of Soviet imperial strategy and tactics. Country by country, region by region, we are presented with a *Who's Who of Marxism's* imperial agents and a what's what of their activities. From America and Azerbaijan through Viet Minh

and Yalta, the hideous record is indexed. The background of daily headlines cataloging Soviet intrigue in various countries of the world is documented by reading the corresponding section of this book. It sheds revealing light also on the personalities involved in other incidents not labelled communist.

Professor Bouscaren points out that the Soviet Union has engaged in eight wars since 1920, excluding its military adventures in Spain, Greece, Korea and South-east Asia and highlights the fact that communism has been exported only at the point of the bayonet. There has never been a spontaneous revolution which has succeeded in starting a Soviet dictatorship save in Russia. This was aided by the German General Staff and sustained by British Foreign Office policy in its early years. The role played in the Spanish Civil War by Soviet agents now leaders of communist governments in enslaved satellites is also enlightening.

This book will be of absorbing interest to all interested in the reconstruction of the social order.

PETER T. FARRELLY, S.J.
Weston College

MOSCOW AND THE CHINESE COMMUNISTS.—By Robert C. North. Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1953, 306 pp. \$5.00.

Past and present relations between Moscow and the Chinese communists has been a subject on which the Western world has been woefully in the dark. Credit is due Mr. North for his clear, masterful treatment of this topic. Starting with the overthrow of the Manchu dynasty, the writer carries us through the fortunes of early communists in their alternating opposition and cooperation with the rising Kuomintang, the "Long March," the "United Front" against Japan, subsequent civil war, success in the "liberation" and the present state of People's Government organization. The author has skillfully chosen from rich source material so that his narration sketches bold outlines of the story interestingly without becoming lost in a welter of details and controversy. Moscow's stupidity and blunders may come as a shock

to those who pictured the Soviets as masterminds at policy and strategy; readers will find them adept at making others scapegoat for their own mistakes and most able in twisting unexpected success to seem predicted by the party line.

Mr. North shows refreshing understanding of communism's methods and policies. One only feels that the account suffers a bit from being so largely based on written documents; those who have lived in China during the periods described may find that documents and reports, in a few cases, do not picture events as they thought they were. The big controversial issues are wisely treated factually and without partisanship. To those who witnessed the mistakes of Marshall, Vincent, Butterworth, Ludden, etc., and who silently had to watch those "in the saddle" pigeonhole or laugh down advice and objections, the plea of Mr. North for leniency in judging them now may seem a bit "soft." Likewise his plea to substitute a bold *revolutionary* spirit for the "book-burning, communist-hunting attitude" no doubt follows the principle that a healthy social body is the best means to prevent infection. But for one who through three long years has watched the psychological and physical wrecks tossed across the border by communism, the reflection comes that even a healthy body must take care to root out certain poisons so lethal and insidious that soundness of body is no guarantee against their infection. This book is most important and well worthwhile for the American public, as well as the specialized reader.

ALBERT R. O'HARA, S.J.
Hong Kong

WAR, COMMUNISM, AND WORLD RELIGIONS.—By Charles S. Braden. Harper, New York, 1953, 281 pp. \$3.50.

The author, chairman of the department of history and literature of religions at Northwestern University, touches a phase of the world struggle against communism too little noticed. It is only natural, when we consider the communist fight against religion, to think at once of the long persecution of the Russian Church, the steady attrition against organized religion in the satellites or the bloody holocausts of China.

Professor Braden treats these subjects only in passing.

The book is rather an evaluation of the strength of the dominant religions in various Asiatic countries as opposition forces to communism. In the course of a journey through Asia the author sought evidence of this opposition and, consequently, of the beneficial effect of the communist threat in instilling new life in old religions. He found these results especially in Japan, in Thailand and Burma and generally in the Moslem countries. India seemed not to have waked to the danger, and Hinduism had shown few signs of revival.

There is a chapter, too, on Judaism and its part in this struggle, but it is necessarily incomplete, since the author limits his study to Israel. He was surprised, however, to find so little sympathy for communism there, even among advanced socialist groups. It was unfortunate that the study was made precisely at the time of the recent anti-Semitic interlude in the Soviet Union. Nonetheless it seems safe to conclude that not only is Judaism, as a religion, necessarily opposed to communism, but that Judaism, as racial sentiment, takes precedence over any hostile internationalism.

From the title we might have expected a fuller treatment of Christian opposition to communism. One chapter is dedicated to this subject. This does not study Christian strength in nations generally considered Christian, but rather contrasts Christian and communist philosophies. Professor Braden finds the Catholic Church most logical in her opposition to communism and most consistent, so that he judges her the most serious foe of communism.

Considering the actual scope of the book, I suggest as a more appropriate title: *Communism vs. World Religions in Asia*. The war theme that the author includes in his title is only incidentally touched, except in the chapter on the Christian position, where pacifism is studied, and, I suspect, subscribed to by the author. There are no doubt certain inaccuracies in this work, for which information was gathered from interviews, largely through interpreters, with persons of varying intelligence and authority. Such a slip obviously is the statement that Lenin was a Jew. (p. 228)

MAURICE F. MEYERS, S.J.
Fordham University

CRISIS IN THE KREMLIN.—By Maurice Hindus. Doubleday, New York, 1953, 319 pp. \$3.95.

In this current volume in his long series on conditions in the Soviet Union, Hindus tries to detect a changing atmosphere about the Kremlin in the transition from Stalin to his successors. The villain of the piece is Stalin, "the most egregious blunderer of our times," and the root of his errors is his failure to understand the world outside Russia.

Mr. Hindus should know his Russia; he was born there and passed early years in the hard life of a White Russian village. Since coming to the United States as a boy, he has returned to the land of his birth as a journalist for stays of varying lengths and seems to have been on terms of comparative intimacy with various high-placed officials. He should therefore be a good witness, and so, even if some of his conclusions are hard to accept, they are worth careful consideration.

The author professes a surprising affection and admiration for Maxim Litvinoff, the advocate of peaceful coexistence with the West, which he understood best of all the Bolsheviks. Stalin's fundamental mistake was scuttling of Litvinoff in favor of Molotoff, with the resultant Russo-German pact of 1939, the wartime aloofness and suspicion of the Soviets towards their own allies and the crude postwar nationalistic imperialism. A second villain, called by Hindus "the Grand Inquisitor," was Andrey Zhdanoff, who engineered the intensified intellectual isolationism and insisted that writers and artists be ventriloquists' dummies for the party.

Perhaps Hindus is oversimple in his thesis and oversanguine in his hopes. He is lost in admiration for the progress made in many fields under the Bolsheviks, "one of the most amazing achievements in all Russian history." With all these achievements, he admits, the ordinary people live in primitive conditions which they are unlikely to bear much longer in silence. Now that Stalin is out of the way, he expects changes and improvements. He does not believe that the new leaders will push towards war, but rather concentrate on strengthening Russia internally and bettering living conditions. The greatest hindrance is the armament race, brought on by the disastrous policy of aggression in

Czechoslovakia and Korea that awoke America from her lethargy.

This is a thought-provoking survey, possibly too uncritical of the earlier years of the regime, possibly too hopeful for a peaceful solution, by successors who have inherited the same system and the same ideology, of the problems caused by Stalin's stupidity.

MAURICE F. MEYERS, S.J.

Russian Center, Fordham University

SOVIET EMPIRE: The Turks of Central Asia and Stalinism.—By Olaf Caroe. St. Martin's Press, New York, 1953, x, 300 pp. \$5.00.

Sir Olaf Caroe's excellent though brief presentation of a little-known Soviet region traces the Uzbek, Tajik, Turkmen, Kazak and other peoples' history, culture and aspirations from tenth-century records to the present. An especially interesting note is the Soviet pattern of nationality suppression—as in the Baltic and East European areas: promises of national integrity, economic dependence on Russia, confusion by language reform, then Russianization by immigration, deportation and education. The author shows, too, through analysis of available population statistics for Kazakistan, an effective genocide in Central Asia.

The author presents the current physical and intellectual subjugation as a continuation of "traditional" Russian expansionism. Tsarist "colonialism" scarcely equalled the Soviet world plan.

Soviet Empire is worthwhile reading for Central Asian students and for all interested in the progress of Soviet imperialism: *divide et impera!* in action.

W. C. JASKIEVICZ, S.J.

Russian Center, Fordham University

FROM LENIN TO MALENKOV: The History of World Communism. — By Hugh Seton-Watson. Praeger, New York, 1953, xv, 377 pp. \$6.00.

As the author carefully explains in his valuable introduction, his work is a comparative analysis of the relationship between communist movements and social classes. The long section on the U.S.S.R.,

as well as those on the countries of Europe, are competently done. On the other hand, Seton-Watson might have referred to more studies capable of compensating for the Marxist bias revealed in E. H. Carr's *The Bolshevik Revolution* and Isaac Deutscher's *Stalin*. Towards this necessary objective, Eugene Lyon's *Stalin, Czar of All the Russias* would go a long way.

Omission of any reference to Eudocio Ravine's *The Yenan Way* seriously weakens the treatment of Latin America. Most unfortunate is the author's confidence in the U. S. Department of State's "white paper" on China, which attempts to whitewash the Marshall-Acheson policies of appeasement. While Seton-Watson makes extensive use of publications by the Institute of Pacific Relations (one of them by an author who took refuge in the Fifth Amendment), he dismisses as "fantastic" most criticisms of State Department policy by irresponsible demagogues—without bothering to name a single one.

Despite the fact that Seton-Watson regards labor as the decisive factor in communist activities in advanced industrial societies, he offers nothing on communism in the United States and Great Britain (his native country). The author insists throughout that all communist activity is controlled directly from Moscow. He also favors liberation of communist-controlled countries, without elaborating the point. While there is much to be learned from Seton-Watson's analyses, the prudent reader will consult other sources in order to compensate for several deficiencies.

WILLIAM HARBISON
St. Louis

WORLD POWER IN THE BALANCE.—

By Tibor Mende. Noonday Press, New York, 1953, 188 pp. \$3.00.

Tibor Mende is a French political economist whose closest American counterpart is Owen Lattimore. Mende repeatedly insists that the peoples of Asia "go communist" or "will go communist" because they are impressed with the great strides made by the U.S.S.R. in the direction of social justice, racial equality and industrialization. The impression left on the reader is that the peoples of China, Korea, Indo-China

and India are leaning ever more toward communism—with specific reference to China. No mention, of course, is made of Chinese war prisoners in Korea who rejected communism overwhelmingly or of the almost unanimous rejection of communism by the Korean people and the gallant fight against communism made by the Republic of Korea.

Mr. Mende not only leads the reader into assuming that the Asian peoples love Soviet "equality" better than Western "liberty," but that the "peoples" of the Soviet Union are willing to continue to make sacrifices for the better world being prepared for them by Malenkov and company.

The author is not an apologist for the Soviet Union but states that the U.S.S.R. and the U. S. A. both have imperial ambitions which must be temporized by world government. Specifically he urges that we "widen the few remaining bridges still precariously connecting our two worlds." He assumes that the Soviet Union will cooperate in peaceful coexistence, the examples of Poland, Finland, Greece, Germany, China, Korea and Indo-China notwithstanding.

In order to solve world economic problems, Mende urges "trade not aid," lower American tariffs, greater European emphasis on agricultural production and European specialization on such things as Swiss watches, French luxury items and German cameras.

ANTHONY T. BOUSCAREN
Marquette University

SOVIET POLICY IN THE FAR EAST, 1944-1951.—By Max Beloff. Oxford University Press, New York, 1953, vi, 278 pp. \$4.00.

This volume is a valuable addition to Beloff's important works on the Soviet foreign policy, since the Soviet Union has won singular victories and is still on the offensive in the Far East. We have here a careful reporting of the facts of Soviet activity in such vital areas as China, Japan, Manchuria, Korea and Southeast Asia. This is a field of special interest to Americans, since the principal contestant with the Soviet Union for influence in

most of these areas was precisely the United States.

We can extract the blueprint of Soviet offensive and contrast methods of opposition, the successful, as in Japan; the inadequate, as in China or Korea, and find lessons to guide us in further dealing with the colossus that still dreams of achieving world power at bargain prices.

It is an interesting book, but hardly an intriguing one, for it is necessarily a mustering of data. At times the facts are weighty and events move swiftly with an almost fatalistic inexorability, as in China and Korea. The chapter on Southeast Asia, however, contributed by another author, makes harder reading, due no doubt to the necessity of covering such a range of countries by the summary recital of what materials could be found.

The book definitely deserves a place on the reference shelf of anyone who hopes to get a full picture of Soviet post-war activity.

MAURICE F. MEYERS, S.J.
Russian Center
Fordham University

FOREIGN POLICY WITHOUT FEAR.—

By Vera Micheles Dean. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1953, xi, 220 pp. \$3.75.

Written at the inception of the Eisenhower Administration, this book is timely as foreign aid programs face further cut-backs and as the original aims of the Point Four Program are lost sight of. The author in presenting a plan for long range foreign policy puts her finger on two fundamental American difficulties. Cast suddenly in a new role—unwanted and unprepared for—we are asked to develop patience and to seek a keener historical perspective for our job.

The author starts with the democratic aims and ideals realized at home but as yet not translated into our foreign policy. However, she insists on our recognizing the varying attitudes and backgrounds of many of our allies. We must face the reality that many historic traditions preclude the immediate and total acceptance of our ideals and solutions.

The second section deals in particular with the problems facing the United States

at present, without detailed examination. The Asian chapter (well done) insists on slowness in our approach. The fact that many small countries there have recently won freedom or are still under colonial rule and exploitation helps to explain their hesitancy in being drawn into the orbit of a nation as wealthy and powerful as our own. Then too, despite our moralizing we are distrusted, as we continue to support unpopular regimes and colonial powers. Such reflections, along with the recollection that we were intently isolationist ourselves until lately, should heighten our caution in pressing for foreign adoption of American policy.

EUGENE P. MCCREESH, S.J.
Woodstock College

PHILOSOPHY AND THE IDEOLOGICAL CONFLICT.—By Charles S. Seely. Philosophical Library, New York, 1953, 319 pp. \$5.00.

This book is a Sunday-supplement edition of the history of philosophy where the history of ideas is merely the conflict between groups neatly labeled "leftists" and "rightists" (terms mutually interchangeable with materialists and idealists). For the author, the hope of the future lies in victory for the left.

We have here the writings of a confused but deadly serious author; it is, in fact, this seriousness, or naiveté rather, which demands that we temper our criticism with sympathy.

D. P. MULVEY, S.J.
Woodstock College

INTRODUCTION TO THE THEORY OF GAMES.—By J. C. C. McKinsey. McGraw-Hill, New York, 1952, 371 pp. \$6.50.

Mathematical developments which today are applied to wide ranges of practical statistical problems were formulated in the eighteenth century by men like Abraham de Moivre who calculated odds for gamblers. A similar development seems to have started in 1928 when J. van Neumann first published the mathematical formulation of

a theory of games designed to describe the sequence of choices open to players and, by thus accurately describing the possibilities as the game proceeds, to improve the basis on which decisions are made. Much good work has been done by many writers since, and the present book is designed as an introduction to this growing branch of mathematics. The mathematics is not elementary and is not integrated, as a promising young plant is growing in several directions at once. For the present therefore the audience must be limited.

Since the concept of games involves choice of strategy, the theory has applications in the moral sciences, and its greatest utility is foreseen in the field of economics, business, politics, military situations and, with further progress, in other social fields.

Thus far only applications to the field of statistical inference in sequential analysis by Wald and to linear programming by Danzig have significant practical applications. The first wrings usable information out of situations where ordinary sampling would be difficult, impossible or costly. The other summarizes in simple, usable form complex cost relationships.

The philosopher and social psychologist will be interested in the assumption that "as n becomes very large, the probability that a large proportion of Smith's opponents will behave rationally becomes small."

B. W. DEMPSEY, S.J.

NATURAL LAW.—By A. P. d'Entrèves. Hutchinson's University Library, London, 1951, 126 pp. 7 s. 6 d.

This small book examines "natural law" and shows its claims to be still valid. The author, realizing the importance of both historical and philosophical aspects of the subject has combined the two.

Natural law is shown to have been responsible for a universally valid system of laws as embodied in Justinian's sixth-century *Corpus Juris Civilis*, for a rational foundation of ethics for St. Thomas in the thirteenth and for a theory of natural rights in the American and French revolutions. However, the author is careful to note that a similarity of words does not

necessarily denote a similarity of ideas. The *jus naturale* of the Roman lawyer, the *lex naturalis* of Aquinas and the *jus naturale* of Grotius are not the same thing. What has actually taken place is that, under the guise of "natural law," there has been a shift from a theory of natural law to a theory of natural rights.

The author locates the essence of law in the intellect, rather than in the will. The relation between law and morals is discussed as the crux of all natural law theory, its presupposition being that the purpose of law is not to make men obedient but to make them good. The doctrine of natural law is, therefore, "nothing but an assertion that law is a part of ethics." Consequently the ideal law is one that lies beyond positive law and in which it must find its ultimate validity. Hence a "pure theory of law," such as Kelsen's, needs a factual basis in natural law—if it is not forever to remain in the realm of the hypothetical.

The book is the fruit of much scholarly work. Two points, however, should be noted. The author is inclined to take the "command" of law as pertaining to an act of the sovereign's will (as it does, for instance, in John Austin), which entails certain undesirable conclusions. But the "command" of law is held by many (for instance, Aquinas) to be an act of the intellect, which results in more desirable consequences. Second, the use of "ideal" in relation to "natural law" seems to leave the way open for a confusion of natural law as something theoretical and meaningful only in a "state of nature" before the "social contract," with natural law as a practical directive expressed by the basic inclinations of a man's nature wherever it be found. It would seem better to keep the accent, not on the "ideal" aspect of natural law, but on the factual.

All in all, however, this book is a good general introduction to natural law.

THOMAS E. DAVITT, S.J.

St. Louis University School of Law

HUME: THEORY OF POLITICS.—Edited by Frederick Watkins. University of Texas Press, Austin, 1953, xxx, 246 pp. \$2.00.

HUME: THEORY OF KNOWLEDGE.—

Edited by D. C. Yalden-Thomson. University of Texas Press, Austin, 1953, xxvii, 265 pp. \$2.00.

These two volumes of Hume are in the Nelson Philosophical Texts series. The *Theory of Politics* contains the first two parts of Book III of Hume's *Treatise of Human Nature* and thirteen of the *Essays, Moral, Political and Literary*. The latter were chosen rather than Hume's *Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals* because the editor believes the *Enquiry* contains little not already developed in the *Treatise* and because the *Essays* are not readily accessible to the average student.

The *Theory of Knowledge* contains the full text of the *Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, Hume's *Abstract* of his *Treatise of Human Nature* and various selections from Book I of the *Treatise* dealing with causality and identity.

A competent essay by the editor introduces each volume with pertinent biographical information, explanation of the selections included, brief analysis of Hume's thought and an estimation of his place in the history of ideas.

THOMAS P. NEILL

St. Louis University

HILAIRE BELLOC: No Alienated Man.—

By Frederick Wilhelmsen. Sheed and Ward, New York, 1953, 108 pp. \$2.75.

This book is a philosophical treatment of modern man in his dilemma of estrangement from his Catholic and cultural past, and Belloc's fight against its causes.

The author, professor of philosophy at the University of Santa Clara, believes that Belloc's principles can be evaluated objectively only if his "cardinal intuition is explored and grasped fully." The theme of this book is Belloc as the "unalienated man . . . the integrated Christian humanist."

Much of Belloc's present-day significance lies in the fulfillment of his prophetic utterances on the social order in the field of socio-economics—his pronouncements on the evils of liberal, industrial capitalism. His theory of economic distribution as a cure to the evil and his ideas on humanitarian society are timely. Yet in

his book, Wilhelmssen, while not ignoring these themes, employs the greater part of the book to interpret the philosophical-historical attitude of Belloc, since it is in history, through the traditions of Christendom, that the essence of the integrated Christian humanist is constituted.

This book is a good introduction to Bellocian works. But it will be of greater value to the reader already acquainted with his writings.

Alice Grosdidier Nicholson
Kansas City, Kans.

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.—By Elizabeth M. Lynskey. Kenedy, New York, 1952, x, 102 pp. \$2.00.

To many, the Catholic Church stands as a riddle more or less sinister. Dr. Lynskey's clear outline of its government, structure and function provides a key to this riddle. The author takes for granted the Church's divine origin, but her analysis of its organization, juridical forms and lines of authority will satisfy the strictest canons of a political scientist. Here the interested or puzzled will find the answers to many questions that trouble minds disturbed by the authoritarian cast of an institution whose activities impinge more and more on their consciousness. The temperate objectivity inspires confidence and dispels doubts. Of particular worth in a day of foggy climates of opinion is the author's thoughtful evaluation of the Church's role as a world society. Blanshard and company will not appreciate the labor; sincere inquirers will find it a help toward comprehension of a misunderstood subject.

Donald Campion, S.J.
Woodstock College

MAX JOSEF METZGER: Priest and Martyr.—Edited by Lilian Stevenson. Macmillan, New York, 1952, 149 pp. \$2.00.

Despite its support by such theologians as Karl Adam and Mathias Laros, the German movement "Una Sancta" is hardly known to Americans. Its founder was the priest whose life and writings are here briefly set forth. Metzger was beheaded as a "traitor" in Brandenburg prison in 1944, during the war.

MAY, 1954

The 24-page biographical sketch makes it clear enough that Metzger's prewar activities for peace and his outspoken disapproval of Nazism caused his imprisonment and death—as such labors did for many Catholics and non-Catholics. In his simple but busy life and his enchanting talks and letters written in prison shines the portrait of a man deeply in love with peace and brotherhood.

RAYMOND BERNARD, S.J.

BENJAMIN FRANKLIN: His Contribution to the American Tradition.—By I. Bernard Cohen. Bobbs-Merrill, Indianapolis, 1953, xxiv, 320 pp. \$3.00

Ben Franklin's heritage has enriched scientist, philosopher, patriot, litterateur. Mr. Cohen's book spotlights that part of the heritage which helped form the American tradition. This book is a judicious selection of Franklin's writings, along with introduction, explanation and synthesis.

Those interested in promoting social justice can learn from Franklin. In his social, civic, philanthropic and even scientific work he had some supernatural motivation: "Here is my creed. I believe in one God, creator of the universe. That He governs it by His Providence." (p. 116)

EARL A. WEIS, S.J.
Weston College

THE FEARLESS HEART.—By Georges Bernanos. Translated by Michael Legat. Newman, Westminster, Md., 1952, 128 pp. \$2.25.

Bernanos studies the interaction of fear and the grace of God in this story of the Carmelite nuns who were guillotined at Paris in 1794. The central character lives her life in constant terror, but accepts death in a triumph of grace.

Written in scenario form, the story is based on Gertrud von le Fort's *The Song from the Scaffold* and an earlier film version by Father Raymond Bruckberger, O.P. The scenario form may distract many readers, but the book is well worth the distractions. Bernanos sees deeply into problems of religion and of the mind and writes well about them.

JOHN WELCH, S.J.
St. Mary's College

237

PROMISES TO KEEP.—By William E. Walsh. Kenedy, New York, 1953, 253 pp. \$3.00.

This is the heart-warming story of a large family, written to demonstrate divine providence as a key to family life. Bill Walsh and his young wife, Avis, start marriage in the depression, and each time a new child arrives—twelve in all—there is a continued lack of money. But by hard work, trust in God, loving spiritual more than material things, praying endless prayers of praise and adoration, somehow they survive. Because Bill wants an intellectual and moral heritage to pass on to his children, he chooses the teaching profession, and the sacrifices entailed in obtaining his doctorate involve the whole family.

The author's free and candid style shares with readers the heartaches and joys of the family. One sorrows with the Walsh's when Billy joins the Navy, when the baby Michaela dies. One sees Bill and Avis make their nightly rounds, blessing each sleeping child as they go. The book is a heartening picture of Christian family life.

BETTY MUNSCH

THE ECONOMIC RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT OF FORMOSA.—By Norton S. Ginsburg. Institute of Pacific Relations, New York, 1953, 58 pp. \$1.00.

The title of this mimeographed report, one of several studies on the economic development of Asian countries, also gives contents and main division. It is helpful for quick, brief, statistical information from immediately available data of Formosa's economic rehabilitation program under the Japanese colonial system and under the American aid program (MSA); useful for its list of current 1952 sources listed at the end of each section; interesting as a case study of a peculiar economy brought about by the transfer of the Chinese Nationalist government and also for points of comparison with other economic recovery programs of other Asiatic countries, especially in the matter of land reform and external financial and technical aid. However the figures in this brochure can easily be outdated and the report as a whole has to be supplemented by a fuller treatment in other books.

VITALIANO GOROSPE, S.J.
Woodstock College

LETTERS

Profit Sharing and Taxes

One point not mentioned by Mr. O'Brien ["Profit Sharing and Organized Labor," March, 1954, pp. 111-14] is that growth, as well as form, of profit-sharing plans in recent years has been determined in large part by tax considerations. Some 15,000 plans are now in operation; about twenty new ones begin each week.

Few employers are disposed to begin profit sharing unless the plan meets requirements of section 165(a), Internal Revenue Code, so that contributions are deductible in computing income-tax liability. The ten-fold growth of plans in the past ten years has been due in large part to high tax rates and the consequent substantial reduction in cost of profit sharing.

Those genuinely interested in improving profit sharing find cause for concern in some proposed amendments to the Internal

Revenue Code. To mention one: giving legislative approval to so-called "one-shot" plans under which a single, probably large, contribution is made from profits, with no commitment or plan for further contributions.

Treasury Department regulations on pension and profit-sharing plans issued after enactment of the Revenue Act of 1942 define a profit-sharing plan as one "established and maintained by an employer to provide for the participation in his profits by his employees . . . , based on a *definite predetermined formula* for determining the profits to be shared and a *definite predetermined formula* for distributing the funds accumulated . . ." (Emphasis added.) Regulations also require that plans be permanent.

Whatever may be said in favor of "one-shot" plans, they cannot seriously be termed profit sharing. But in two recent decisions

of the U. S. Court of Appeals [Lincoln Electric Company v. Commissioner, 190 Fed. (2) 325, (C. A. 6th Circuit, 1951); Produce Reporter Company v. Commissioner, 207 Fed. (2) 586 (C.A. 7th Circuit, 1953)] such plans have been held to qualify for tax exemption and deduction. Decision is based on the ground that the law requires no predetermined formula for continued contributions and that Treasury regulations requiring such formula are void. Apparently these decisions will not be reviewed by the U. S. Supreme Court.

If the Internal Revenue Code should now be amended as proposed (see *Hearings before the Ways and Means Committee*, 83rd Congress, First Session, p. 431 sqq.) to permit such plans to qualify for tax exemption and deduction under the classification of "profit sharing," further confusion will have been introduced into the concept, as distinguished from the simple year-end bonus. The employer can then wait the year end to decide whether to make a contribution and the amount to be distributed. If tax rates decline, it may be anticipated that profit sharing contributions will also decline.

It is not likely that such developments will advance the cause of true profit sharing.

JAMES F. RYAN

Dubuque, Iowa

Social Tour

The editing done on my article, "A Social Tour," (April, 1954) disturbed me not a little. We had agreed that you should combine my two articles, "Letter From Europe" and "Letter From a German Steel Plant," into one article in accordance with some editorial policy. I realize, too, that an editor has to meet certain exigencies of space. But that my two articles, already compactly written, should be cut from a total of 8,000 words into a hurried presentation of 3,000 words, struck me as being improper. Aside from the impossibility of using the articles elsewhere (which an extended European experience would seem to warrant), I think we owe it to your readers to let them know the article as published was quite different from the originals.

Changing phrases expressive of my attitudes, omitting others expressing either

facts or qualifications, other slight inaccuracies and large deletions made the article one which I regret seeing under my by-line. I would ask your readers to be kind enough to keep the above in mind while evaluating the article.

JOSEPH B. SCHUYLER, S.J.

Fordham University

I must say that I liked that account of his "social" travels by Joseph Schuyler, S.J. He keeps his eyes open and expressed himself excellently.

H. A. BISSONNE

St. Louis

Protestants and I.C.P.

I have been somewhat slow in dealing with "Protestants on I.C.P." (January, 1954) out of scholarly respect for its author, your very able contributing editor, Philip S. Land, S.J.

I am now quite sure that Father Land has interpreted the position of Dr. Howard R. Bowen on Industry Councils as being less favorable to ICP than Dr. Bowen really is. Father Land has also emphasized the things which Bowen said in opposition to ICP without fully reporting the things which Bowen said in favor. To make a long letter short, the words of my two preceding sentences are taken almost verbatim from correspondence with Dr. Bowen himself. He also approves of the use of his correspondence in this communication.

Space will not permit a detailed illustration of the proof of Dr. Bowen's criticism of Father Land's article. Interested readers can make comparisons for themselves. My own conclusion is that Dr. Bowen is quite favorable to ICP and that this type of Protestant thinking on ICP is more soundly progressive in many respects than the thinking of some of our own Catholic readers.

WILLIAM G. DOWNING, S.J.

The Creighton University

Place of Self-Restraint

Last week I read a history of the rise and decline of economic Liberalism (capital "L" to indicate the classical variety). This week I had to read (parts of) the

female-Kinsey book. I found myself with a strong but elusive impression of similarity. A week passes—I've got it!

Economic Liberalism argued—successfully, especially in France, England and the United States—for the complete liberation of a force which our western civilization up to that time had kept hobbled by some social disapproval and legal restraint. That was the drive and the ability of the born entrepreneur to make money; lots of it. Society's acceptance of economic Liberalism was short-lived; in no country did it last as long as a century. The theorists had forgotten to subtract the disadvantages from the advantages of liberation. When society discovered that the net figure was negative, it realized anew why the old taboos had existed, and began to reinstate them.

Kinsey also is arguing—earnestly, enthusiastically—for the liberation of a powerful force from its traditional restraints, the force of sex. And he is making the same kind of mistake. He is overlooking the advantages that come from restraint. He is overlooking the testimony of Gandhi, for example, that more was gained in his higher nature of intellect and will, than the pleasure was worth which he lost through his vow of chastity and the other restraints he imposed on his body. The society which follows Kinsey's emphasis will learn to its sorrow that his guidance is as recklessly independent of the experience of the ages and as untrustworthy as was that of extreme economic Liberalism.

JOSEPH M. BECKER, S.J.

In the Opinion of Readers—

... Father Thomas' article [March, 1954] is very well done.

HAROLD E. FEY
The Christian Century, Chicago

"Medicine, a Public Utility?" and "How Co-op Health Plans Work" (October, 1953) were valuable in discussion of the distribution of health facilities. Father Duff's factual presentation of both sides of the dispute is a relief after the many overblown statements from disputants.

JARED WICKS, S.J.
West Baden Springs, Indiana

There is no need to say that I am a keen reader of *SOCIAL ORDER*—anyone who reads it must become keen.

LIAM BROWNE
Tullamore, Offaly, Ireland

Personally I think that *SOCIAL ORDER* is an excellent source of up-to-date material for any seminarian who is seriously studying Catholic moral and dogmatic theology. Careful and thoughtful reading of *SOCIAL ORDER* during the later years of seminary work should certainly be rewarded with a more vital and prudent understanding of Catholic doctrine and the priest's role in society today.

ALCUIN GREENBURG, O.S.B.
Conception, Mo.

Do you ever intend to sell at the end of the year bound copies?

F. A. MCQUADE
Xavier High School, New York

» Bound copies of all completed volumes are available at \$5.50 each. For details see "... just a few things:" December, 1953, p. 434. Ed.



isms

The article by Bernard W. Dempsey on Capitalism begins a series in which *SOCIAL ORDER* hopes to treat the prevalent 'isms' that influence social conditions in the world today.

"Liberalism," by Thomas P. Neill, will be the second in the series.

Others will be announced.

Worth Reading

Charles H. Seaver, "The Capitalist Welfare State," *Social Action*, 5 (March, 1954) 2-26.

A Congregationalist economist formerly in the employ of the National Association of Manufacturers here attempts to show that the government is not (and could not be) negative in its attitude toward economics and welfare.

Arnold M. Rose, "The Social Responsibility of the Social Scientist," *Social Problems*, 3 (January, 1954) 85-90.

"Once the social scientists gain the social knowledge which can be used to control physical knowledge and to control society, how will this social knowledge be controlled?" Values *do* motivate people, the scientists are finding, and some fear that the "wrong" values may influence social scientists. In general, Dr. Rose would have them acquire a sense of "social responsibility" (a sort of dedication to democracy).

A. A. Liveright, "A Long Look at Labor Education," *Adult Education*, 3 (February, 1954) 101-8.

This article, to be followed by a second part, looks critically at the state of labor education, labor educators and their agencies and finds a great, continuing interest in the field—along with some serious problems.

Max Gordon, "Spotlight on Denmark," *Irish Monthly*, 83 (March, 1954) 92-94.

Highlights of the new Danish Constitution which establishes a unicameral legislature, a minority referendum and gives national status to Greenland and the Faroe islands.

Thomas P. Monahan and William M. Kephart, "Divorce and Desertion by Religious and Mixed-Religious Groups," *American Journal of Sociology*, 59

(March, 1954) 454-65.

While couples with Protestant, Catholic and Jewish backgrounds are divorced in that order, Catholics are involved in a disproportionately high number of desertions.

Calvin B. Hoover, "Institutional and Theoretical Implications of Economic Change," *American Economic Review*, 44 (March, 1954) 1-14.

Institutional changes in the economy which have magnified the role of labor, government, management have transformed capitalism into something which may be described as the "organizational economy."

George A. Kelly, "The Puerto Rican and the Church of New York," *Integrity*, 8 (April, 1954) 35-41.

The present status and future prospects of Puerto Ricans in the archdiocese of New York.

Pius XII, "Religion in the Community of Nations," *Catholic Mind*, 52 (April, 1954) 244-51.

The celebrated allocution to the convention of Italian Catholic Jurists, December 6, 1953, which inspired Gustave Weigel's article, *America*, January 9, 1954.

Randolfo Pacciardi, "Democracy Lives in Italy," *Foreign Affairs*, 32 (April, 1954) 440-45.

The leader of the Italian Republican party finds sound hope for democracy in Italy and little prospect that communists will be admitted to a coalition government.

Francis Conklin, S.J., "Some Aspects of the Marxian Philosophy of God," *New Scholasticism*, 28 (January, 1954) 38-57.

Criticism by Marx and Engels of contemporary ideas of God and the origins of antitheistic humanism.

Indispensable

*in keeping up with social and
economic books*

That's what readers, students, librarians and other busy persons say of the reviews in SOCIAL ORDER.

A Tokyo editor says he counts on "Books" every month, to tell him clearly, concisely what to order for his shelves.

Librarians here at home select social and economic titles according to the evaluations of our reviewers.

For instance, in recent issues you saw a cluster of reviews by

JOHN L. THOMAS—

on the general field of marriage and the family. His research in this field has won respect and acclaim from many sociologists. Shortly we expect to run more of his work.

Among the reviewers are also Joseph M. Becker, Maurice Meyers, C. C. Zimmerman, Joseph Bonsirven, Douglas Hyde, Kurt von Schuschnigg, William L. Lucey, Raymond Miller, John LaFarge, Bernard W. Dempsey, Carl F. Taeusch, Dorothy Willman, Anthony L. Bouscaren, Edward Duff, H. A. Reinhold and C. S. Mihanovich.

Turn to "Books" this month, next month, *every month*—
for the *best* reviews

SOCIAL ORDER 3655 West Pine, St. Louis 8, Mo.

Other reviewers whose judgments guided you in past months—

JOHN F. CRONIN
DAVID and ANN CHOPIN
MARION M. GANEY
ROBERT F. DRINAN
ALICE NICHOLSON
H. K. JUNCKERSTORFF
GEZA B. GROSSCHMID
WALTER J. ONG
PHILIP S. LAND
T. A. MOGILNITZKY
RICHARD E. MULCAHY
BETTY MUNSCH
THOMAS P. NEILL
FELIX P. BIESTEK
N. S. TIMASHEFF
TRAFFORD P. MAHER
GERALD J. SCHNEPP
STUART A. QUEEN
ANITA YOURGLICH
JAMES J. MCGINLEY
JAMES COLLINS
IRENE BEHAN
ED MARCINIAK
J. M. OESTERREICHER
GLADYS GRUENBERG
J. M. O'NEILL
CHARLES DONAHUE
LEO C. BROWN
P. R. HOFSTAETTER
JOHN V. SPIELMANS

MAY, 1954

SOCIAL ORDER

3655 WEST PINE BLVD.
ST. LOUIS 8, MO.



MAY, 1954